

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S77.010	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S40.011	Martin John Yuretich	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows:Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S41.011	Joel Vieviorka	General / Process	Oppose	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows:Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	
S163.016	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	<p>Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land.</p> <p>Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.</p>	Reject
S377.011	Rua Hatu Trust	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	<p>Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land.</p> <p>Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.</p>	Reject
S410.011	Kerry-Anne Smith	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	<p>Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives.</p> <p>Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land.</p> <p>Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					might actually start to value and respect you.	
S470.011	Helmut Friedrick Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S161.010	Shanon Garton	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S541.036	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	The council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers	Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and the community back to the government.		
S519.012	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S538.002	Te Tii (Waitangi) B3 Trust	General / Process	Support in part	The infrastructure servicing Puketona Ave, Te Kemara Ave, Te Karuwha Parade and Tahuna Road, Waitangi is old and outdated.	Amend to incorporate a planned approach to upgrade community drainage and services and address effects of coastal erosion at Te Tii Beach and Waitangi. This includes upgrading substandard and poor drainage along Tahuna Road to Te Tii Beach, addressing insufficient or no pathways along Te Karuwha and Tahuna Road, addressing open drains, poor roads and lighting along Te Karuwha and Tahuna Road, and providing a plan which directly addresses Te Tii Beach erosion and erosion under the Waitangi Bridge in Waitangi's coastal environment.	Reject
S485.012	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S395.011	Sean Jozef Vercammen	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	
S472.048	Michael Foy	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S547.037	LJ King Limited	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do and start fighting for your community. Otherwise you are just puppets of the government and not our community's representatives. Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place	Reject
S439.011	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you	
S477.001	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	General / Process	Not Stated	Whilst we are broadly supportive of the changes to the District Plan as proposed, we would like to comment on the broader planning context. The District Plan review process is well overdue, and we are generally supportive of the review given this. However, it should be noted that given the review of the overall resource management system and planning frameworks within Aotearoa currently, we are of the position that the timing of the District Plan review process could have been more considered. We wish to state that given that the proposed District Plan is likely to become operative under the Resource Management Act 1991, the proposed changes should be cognisant of the inevitability of the Natural and Built Resources Act (or whichever moniker is eventually adopted) and other relevant Acts and planning instruments that	Amend the Plan as required to ensure that it has regard to pending reforms and statutory documents as required - such as the repeal of the Resource Management Act, and various National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				are proposed by the resource management review process currently being undertaken by central government. There are a suite of National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards currently under consideration that the District Plan will be legislatively required to enact once operative. We would like to iterate that the proposed District Plan should be forward thinking in its intent and consider these and any other relevant developments.		
S485.048	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do and start fighting for your community. Otherwise you are just puppets of the government and not our community's representatives. Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.	Reject
S276.001	Russell Landcare Trust	General / Process	Support in part	The Plan is difficult to follow and this online portal makes it difficult for lay-people to make submissions and be involved in the process.	Not stated	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There are too many drop boxes, which are compulsory fields. Many people do not have a computer with two screens - in practice, this is necessary so one screen can be used to view the Plan while the submission form is being completed. We accept that receiving submissions in this format simplifies matters for FNDC staff but it comes at the cost of effective public consultation. Our comments on the Draft Plan are attached. In this submission, we request that these matters be addressed.			
FS128.1	Connie salisbury		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS93.16	Leonie M Exel		Support		Allow		Reject
FS88.56	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part		Reject
FS332.171	Russell Protection Society		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.798	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.812	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.834	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S333.001	P S Yates Family Trust	General / Process	Support in part	<p>As described in the National Planning Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped. While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole. In many instances, overlays apply to part of but not the whole of the site. Applying the provisions to the site as a whole in these situations would not serve the</p>	<p>Insert a new clause specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay.</p>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>resource management purpose of the overlay. In addition to the above, the following part of the explanation is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the provisions relating to an activity. For example, residential activity may not be provided for in the overlay, but is provided for in the underlying zoning: "Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but there are no overlay rules that are applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone)".</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS24.65	Lynley Newport		Support	Good point raised by submitter. Confusing for a land owner as to what provisions apply where in the instance where an overlay only applies partially to their land. Agreed with decision sought by submitter.	Allow	Reject
S529.040	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Process	Oppose	Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our communities value. We believe the council should consider introducing a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications. We believe that two separate queues for processing applications could prevent simple minor works being held up by larger or more complex applications.	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.	Reject
FS88.4	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS93.42	Leonie M Exel		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1930	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS566.1944	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS569.1966	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
S338.041	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Process	Not Stated	Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our communities value. We believe the council should consider introducing a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications. We believe that two separate queues for processing applications could prevent simple minor works being held up by larger or more complex applications.	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.9	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.979	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS566.993	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS569.1015	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
S541.011	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
FS155.1	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject
FS155.2	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject
S427.028	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Process	Oppose	Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our communities value.	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS155.3	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject
S465.001	Groundswell NZ	General / Process	Oppose	<p>One of the complaints Groundswell NZ has consistently received from across the country relates to private land being captured under various zones. The main ones include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant Natural Areas - Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features and other landscape zonings coming under various names. - Sites of Significance to Maori, cultural sites, and cultural landscapes. - Wetlands <p>Principal concerns relating to these zonings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Turns natural and cultural values into a liability rather than an asset. We are aware of landowners throughout the country removing these values not because they don't value them but because they live in fear of having them on their property. - Penalizes environmental endeavour with those property owners most proactive in protecting natural and/or cultural values penalized the most. - Impacts property values with, in some cases, 	<p>Seek to pause the district plan process until the failings of the RMA outlined in this submission are addressed, and there is clarity around the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity and the RMA replacement the Natural and Built Environment Act (NBA). If this is not accepted, then our submission would be the sections relating to the zoning issues above be paused or removed altogether.</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				substantial loss of property values for those that have most, or all of their property captured under zones. Many property owners are facing multiple regulatory zones on their properties. - Forces councils into conflict with their communities and their most conservation minded constituents.			
FS155.4	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS25.009	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS349.006	Northland Regional Council		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS332.217	Russell Protection Society		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS325.007	Turnstone Trust Limited		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
S354.001	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Process	Support	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.	Prepares a motherhood/policy statement/vision which makes it clear to FNDC management that responsible pet ownership is positive for our community, and enhances community wellbeing. This should also make it clear that complete transparency around dog bans or restrictions is required.		Reject
FS88.88	Stephanie Lane		Support	I support all of the BOI Watchdogs submission. I don't have time to submit on each clause, so please	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				read this a support/allow for all of them.			
FS570.1010	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1024	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1046	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS207.1	Dingwall Family Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
S429.009	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Process	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 FMs1.3(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 FMs3.5(4)) -Avoiding the loss of wetlands and protecting their		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
					<p>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.</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-When subdivision or development takes place, all waterways should be protected by requirements for native planting and other measures.</p>		
FS87.1	Margaret Symons		Support in part		Allow in part	Reject	
FS25.006	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS354.001	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow S429.009 to include provisions for freshwater.	Accept
S338.013	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Process	Not Stated	The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial	Amend the PDP to require development contributions when Council has adopted policy on development contributions as part of its Long Term Plan (Inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				contributions (chapter 14). However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden.			
FS25.004	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Development contributions under the Local Government Act are an appropriate mechanism. While development contributions are generally dealt with under separate policy instruments, it may be appropriate to include reference to development contributions in the FNDP.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS325.004	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS277.8	Jenny Collison		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.954	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.968	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.990	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S519.047	Elbury Holdings	General / Process	Support in part	The council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.	Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.		Reject
FS196.239	Joe Carr		Support	I hope all the quango submitters note this well	Allow		Reject
S451.021	Pacific Eco-Logic	General / Process	Not Stated	Monitoring and compliance are needed to assess the effectiveness of the district plan rules for addressing matters in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act. Monitoring and compliance are not adequately addressed in the proposed district plan Many people are unaware or choose to be unaware of the requirements for consent for activities such as vegetation clearance. This means that requirements for retrospective consent are common	Insert an environmental monitoring and compliance strategy as an Appendix to the Plan Implement a public awareness programme with Northland Regional Council to inform better people of the requirements for consent for activities such as vegetation clearance, land drainage and earthworks.		Reject
FS332.208	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS570.1526	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1540	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1562	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S522.027	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Process	Oppose	Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our communities value. We	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				believe the council should consider introducing a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications. We believe that two separate queues for processing applications could prevent simple minor works being held up by larger or more complex applications.			
FS277.7	Jenny Collison		Oppose	Vision Kerikeri is an excellent organisation which would be aware of the pitfalls of this type of approach	Disallow		Accept
FS566.1766	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S454.022	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	General / Process	Support	Transpower generally supports the provisions set out on Part 1 of the FNPDP.	Retain Part 1 of the FNPDP.		Accept in part
FS369.136	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this objective as notified	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.165	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Process	Not Stated	Monitoring and compliance are needed to assess the effectiveness of the district plan rules for addressing matters in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act. Monitoring and	Insert an environmental monitoring and compliance strategy as an Appendix to the Plan. Implement a public awareness programme with Northland Regional Council to inform better people of the requirements for consent for activities such as vegetation clearance, land drainage and earthworks.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliance are not adequately addressed in the proposed district plan Many people are unaware or choose to be unaware of the requirements for consent for activities such as vegetation clearance. This means that requirements for retrospective consent are common.			
FS346.776	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
S569.011	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.		Reject
FS348.242	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA		submission be disallowed	
S464.039	LJ King Ltd	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do and start fighting for your community. Otherwise you are just puppets of the government and not our community's representatives. Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.		Reject
FS566.1582	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
S543.037	LJ King Limited	General / Process	Support in part	Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, but also in its role under the Local Government Act it is to enable democratic local decision making and action by and on behalf of communities, so in essence it is also required to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back to the government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do and start fighting for your community. Otherwise you are just puppets of the government and not our community's representatives. Enable the community to achieve desirable outcomes the way they see it, not in a way dictated by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experience the way our community works and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force and don't put bureaucratic deterrents in place.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2198	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
S146.011	Trevor John Ashford	General / Process	Support in part	While I know that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.		Reject
S31.001	Simon Coe	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	For support	Retain the Proposed District Plan as notified (inferred)		Accept in part
S82.001	Good Journey Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The provisions of the PDP are such that double negatives are used in the plan provisions which can create confusion and the wording should be simplified so that the community can understand the purpose and effect of these rules.	Amend the Plan to simplify wording such that the provisions (together with the associated definitions) can be readily understood by a broad sector of the community.		Reject
S82.002	Good Journey Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	There appears to be an undue reliance on full discretionary activity status for what should be straight forward applications which unduly adds to uncertainty and	Amend Plan so that limited use is made of fully discretionary activity status in the provisions, and greater use made of controlled and restricted discretionary activity status with clear limits on discretion and assessment criteria so as to enhance certainty for the development community.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliance costs and this is not appropriately recognised in Part 1 "Classes of Activities" and the corresponding rules nor the accompanying s.32 analysis.		
S60.001	Wai 2003 and Wai 250 Claimant Groups Te Wahapu and Hokianga	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In the Māori world view, "The Land is to live on" and "Land is to live from". A simple philosophy, but unsustainable in terms of how land is used today and regulated. The future of Hokianga requires a unique approach to enable landowners to utilise their land.	Amend the Plan to withdraw Hokianga from the process and treat it independently under separate evaluation. There must be a proper evaluation of land ownership and uses carried out for Hokianga.	Reject
S411.011	Roger Myles Smith	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitter considers that while that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	Reject
S257.032	Te Hiku Community Board	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitter considers that while that the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	
S438.001	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Far North District Council has a permissive 'Camping in Public Places (2016)' policy which permits freedom camping in specific areas within the district, while freedom camping is a discretionary activity under the PDP. This outcome is inconsistent with the permissive intent of the camping policy and visitors complying with the policy may be unknowingly in breach of the PDP rules.	Amend to either exclude freedom camping from requiring resource consent or make freedom camping a permitted activity.	Reject
S427.001	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP has several significant weaknesses that make it difficult to achieve the intended overall objectives. The rules/standard for permitted activities address limited matters, containing insufficient rules/standards relating to environmental values. The PDP frequently defaults to discretionary activity' status. This means the proposal should be considered by developers and council planners on the basis of PDP objectives and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>policies. However, many of the policies are written in vague terms that are open to wide interpretation. We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.</p>		
S427.008	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.</p>	<p>Amend to insert a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.</p>	Reject
S538.001	Te Tii (Waitangi) B3 Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>Waitangi currently sees and experiences the effects climate change and TTB3 Trust is concerned for their community,</p>	<p>Insert a mitigation management plan into the PDP which addresses effects of climate change in the Waitangi area.</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				people, assets and future. The Tii Beach foreshore bears the brunt of climate change and will continued to be affected into the future. The loss of a significant area of Maori whenua must be stopped.		
S368.036	Far North District Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	For usability, the reference to Policy TW-P6 within the policy framework of various chapters should provide a link to TW-P6	Amend where policies throughout the plan refer to Policy TW-P6, to include a link to that policy.	Accept
S427.009	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial contributions (chapter 14). However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden.	Amend the PDP to include provisions for meaningful development contributions to address the need for, and cost of, infrastructure [inferred].	Reject
S427.022	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	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
S397.001	Ian Ray (Joe) Carr	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	I support and commend the use throughout the notified PDP of the activity status Restricted Discretionary. This, I consider gives the community much certainty	Retain - the restricted discretionary status for activities, and - the structure of the Plan	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and reduces bureaucracy, and I support in principle other submissions for the greater use of restrictive discretionary status activities. I support the structure of this FNDC PDP.		
S389.017	Merata Kawharu Taituha, Renata Tane, Albie Apiata, Billie Taituha and Hirini Tane	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We would like to emphasise three key values as being values that may also underpin the Council's proposed plan and how it works: Kotahitanga: Inclusivity and working together; Mana: The rights, status, authority and positioning of individuals and groups; Manaakitanga: The counter to mana, that embraces the kinship ethic of considering the needs and interests of others, extending hospitality and care We also see the value in considering the roles and responsibilities of Council and tangata whenua as dynamics within the realms of Papatūānuku and Ranginui. Law and tikanga will guide what needs to be done.	Amend the plan to recognise the key values outlined in the submission summary (inferred)	Reject
S399.010	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Mātauranga Māori is inconsistently spelled.	Amend the spelling of Mātauranga throughout the Plan to include macron.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S399.049	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Employ consistent use of macrons throughout the proposed district plan.	Amend the Plan to employ consistent use of macrons over Māori vowels	Accept
S512.119	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	While Fire and Emergency strongly supports the reference to SNZ PAS 4509:2008 in the plan, the list of documents incorporated by reference on Council's website is incomplete as it indicates that the only part of the plan referencing the document is 'Part 2 - District-Wide Matters/Hazards and Risks/Natural Hazards/NH-R6. This is incomplete. Furthermore, the Code of Practice is free to download through the Fire and Emergency New Zealand website - Council's website indicates the document is 'Not free to download but available for inspection at Council offices',	Amend advisory information posted on Council's website listing documents incorporated by reference, particularly as relates to SNZ PAS 4509:2008 - New Zealand Fire Service firefighting water supplies code of practice	Accept
S544.011	Kelvin Richard Horsford	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitter considers that while Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: While Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government. Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the community back up to government.	achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.	
S363.003	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The submitter identifies that each PDP chapter includes implementation advice notes. Many of these notes apply across chapters e.g. Infrastructure chapter note 5, limits the infrastructure provisions to network utility operators only. This note is easily missed any could lead to plan interpretation issues.	Amend all implementation advice notes across the plan to ensure consistency, and list notes which apply across multiple chapters in the How the plan works chapter.	Reject
S439.012	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	I urge FNDC to avoid stating any support for the Bill in its PDP (and any other published document) and instead to be much more prominent in its opposition to it, including in the above cited provisions in the PDP. I understand that FNDC has received \$7.8 million from LGNZ without any reference to the Bill. If Central Government and/or LGNZ later apply any such conditions to that money, I further urge FNDC to resist any such conditions that have been applied after the fact. As a last resort, FNDC should	not stated	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>return the \$7.8m, resign from LGNZ and re-emphasise its opposition to the Bill.</p> <p>FNDC needs to fight for its ongoing management of three waters and to seek the funding that Central Government has currently ear-marked for implementing the Bill. A successful outcome is much much more likely for the same, or even reduced, cost if councils were to receive that funding.</p> <p>In talking to many Te Hiku ratepayers in my campaign to be elected as councillor, these sentiments were commonly agreed with.</p>		
S516.010	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>Each PDP chapter includes implementation advice notes. Many of these notes apply across chapters e.g. Infrastructure chapter note 5, limits the infrastructure provisions to network utility operators only. This note is easily missed and could lead to plan interpretation issues.</p>	Amend all implementation advice notes across the plan to ensure consistency, and list notes which apply across multiple chapters in the How the Plan Works chapter.	Reject
S516.012	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>While the PDP includes activity-based rules which manage the establishment and operation of activities within zones and sites, the rules include activities that</p>	Amend rules as necessary to refer only to defined terms used in activity-based rules.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				do not have definitions and there are various discrepancies between the activities and terms utilised within the zone and resource overlay chapters.		
S486.018	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The RMA defines effect to include positive, adverse, cumulative and other effects, all of equal importance. While the PDP has adopted this definition, many of its provisions single out adverse effects only for consideration, without reference to positive effects. This has the potential to constrain the development of Māori land, because the positive effects of development are to be given only secondary consideration.	Amend plan provisions requiring specific consideration of adverse effects, either by deleting the word "adverse" by adding equal references to positive and cumulative effects.	Reject
S395.014	Sean Jozef Verammen	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	I urge FNDC to avoid stating any support for the Bill in its PDP (and any other published document) and instead to be much more prominent in its opposition to it, including in the above cited provisions in the PDP. I understand that FNDC has received \$7.8 million from LGNZ without any reference to the Bill. If Central Government and/or LGNZ later apply any such conditions to that	not stated	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>money, I further urge FNDC to resist any such conditions that have been applied after the fact. As a last resort, FNDC should return the \$7.8m, resign from LGNZ and re-emphasise its opposition to the Bill.</p> <p>FNDC needs to fight for its ongoing management of three waters and to seek the funding that Central Government has currently ear-marked for implementing the Bill. A successful outcome is much much more likely for the same, or even reduced, cost if councils were to receive that funding.</p>		
S390.013	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the RMA defines effect to include positive, adverse, cumulative and other effects, all of equal importance. While the PDP has adopted this definition, many of its provisions single out adverse effects only for consideration, without reference to positive effects. This has the potential to constrain the development of Māori land, because the positive effects of development are to be given only secondary consideration.</p>	Amend any plan provisions requiring specific consideration of adverse effects, either by deleting the word "adverse" by adding equal references to positive and cumulative effects.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S573.003	Te Kawariki me Te Wānanga o Te Rangi Aniwaniwa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>All Iwi involved with Te Kahu o Taonui criticise the FNDC for breaching the statutory consultation obligations under Schedule 1, clause 3(d) of the RMA by not properly consulting over its development of the annual plan.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward councillors work alongside Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC boundaries to develop a Mana Whakahono a Rohe Agreement that strengthens the rangatiratanga and influence of Twi and HapO in local government and the management of te taiao as outlined in section 33 of Resource Management Act .</p> <p>That Iwi/ HapO plans sit parallel alongside FNDC Annual plans in 2023 onwards.</p> <p>That the task of FNDC is to stop the alienation of remaining Maori lands , abandoned Maori lands.</p> <p>That all SNAs be removed from the FNDC annual plan.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors broker, link and network with many agencies to bring about necessary improvement works for Iwi (as listed</p>	Amend the Plan where possible to align with the outcomes sought to the Annual Plan (inferred).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>p41) , hapu and Maori Social Service agencies.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors consult with Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC to confirm 4 takiwa for Maori ward councillors to manaaki/ mahi tahi in dealings with the FNDC.</p> <p>That the Maori Ward Councillors engage with Maori in four designated takiwa in a 8 months trial period, before final consultation Matariki 2023.</p> <p>That 200 homes be built in the next 3 years for struggling whanau .</p> <p>That all marae as public event centres have 500m tar seal either side of the marae .</p> <p>That Councillors seek funding to train tertiary students to develop resource consents for the FNDC.</p> <p>That Maori and local contractors be given opportunities to submit tenders for Council projects.</p>		
S354.008	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Northland Regional Council advises landlords to include restrictions in their tenancy agreements on pet ownership. Refer to full submission.	Instruct FNDC management to support dog owners who are tenants by encouraging the Northland Regional Council to remove advice on their website, or on any other documents, that landlords should not allow pets on tenancy agreements.	Reject
FS88.7	Stephanie Lane		Support	It's so important for people to be allowed to have their	Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				animals with them. They offer friendship, security and love. Tenants deserve to benefit from animals as much as anyone and shouldn't be disadvantaged by arbitrary disallowing of pets in rental accomodation. In general, pets cause less damage than children and drug addicts. Most people with animals in their family would be happy to pay an extra "animal bond" to protect landlords. I certainly would!			
FS570.1017	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1031	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1053	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S460.001	Shirley Grant Murray	General / Plan Content /	Neutral	FNDC management's choices to ban and restrict dog owners for two decades indicates that	Supports recommended decisions in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Miscellaneous		<p>they have not considered the unintended consequences of their actions. Those consequences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs 		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing requirements),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed, - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs, - decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, - lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists 		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to live in more and more townships.		
FS93.25	Leonie M Exel		Support	Please! Allow our community to unite: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education 	Allow	Reject
FS88.21	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow	Reject
S566.001	Karen B Wilkinson	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Neutral	FNDC management's choices to ban and restrict dog owners for two decades indicates that they have not considered the unintended consequences of their actions. Those consequences include: - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people	Amend PDP to address relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing requirements), - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed,</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs, - decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, - lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to 		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				live in more and more townships.			
FS93.26	Leonie M Exel		Support	<p>Please! Allow our community to unite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education 	Allow		Reject
FS88.22	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS348.024	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose		Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept
S469.001	Angela Caroline Morley	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	<p>The specific provisions of the Plan that our submission relates to are, as far as we can tell, listed below:</p> <p>Any objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna,</p>	Amend Plan to give effect to relief sought in the 'Bay of Islands Watchdog' submission (354).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). Official records of recent FNDC decisions on consenting issues, confirmed the District Plan provisions are being overridden by practise notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or the district, and raises questions about the statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. I ask Council to make those critical documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information, publicly available now. I have recently moved to the Bay of Islands and over the years I have owned and bred dogs as</p>			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>well as the odd rescue cat. I am a member of the Bay of Islands Watchdogs and I support their submissions and their recommendations as it is of great concern to me the very significant animal welfare problem that exists in the Far North which was certainly not obvious from all the recommendations made to me when considering my move to the Bay of Islands. FNDC management's choices to ban and restrict dog owners for two decades indicates that they have not considered the unintended consequences of their actions. There are additional issues which have had a critical impact on trust between council management and the dog-loving community. These are detailed in the BOI Watchdog submission and need to be addressed urgently as they underlie the mistrust that has built over many years between FNDC and dog owners, which in turn damages FNDC's capacity to engage with the community to encourage compliance with the</p>			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				District Plan, both Operative and Proposed.		
FS88.18	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part	Reject
FS93.49	Leonie M Exel		Support		Allow	Reject
S529.001	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>The PDP has several significant weaknesses that make it difficult to achieve the intended overall objectives. The rules/standard for permitted activities address limited matters, containing insufficient rules/standards relating to environmental values. The PDP frequently defaults to 'discretionary activity' status. This means the proposal should be considered by developers and council planners on the basis of PDP objectives and policies. However, many of the policies are written in vague terms that are open to wide interpretation. We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.</p>	<p>Amend PDP to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities. reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word 'avoid' should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially. recognise that undesirable activities that should be avoided should be classed as non-complying or prohibited, instead of discretionary. incorporate additional rules to protect the environment and amenity values, and to address climate change issues relevant to the types of activities. 	Reject
FS67.17	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in this submission could have wide reaching implications (such as 'using the word	Disallow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'avoid' more often') however lacks the specificity required of a submission to allow a proper understanding of its effect ie which objectives and policies are sought to be amended and exactly how. For this reason the submission should be disallowed.			
FS68.18	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS69.17	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS66.25	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS111.108	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support		Allow	allow original submission	Reject
FS243.242	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose		Disallow in part	Amend to rezone from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone for all properties accessed from The Ridge, Kerikeri 0230 (refer to Attachment 2 of the submission)	Accept
FS570.1891	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1905	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1927	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S429.004	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.	<p>Amend the Plan to ensure that when subdivision, land use or development is considered, it gives effect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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 FMs1.3(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 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<p>requirement, these systems should at minimum be given priority over systems that rely on dispersal or disposal via water.</p> <p>-When subdivision or development takes place, all waterways should be protected by requirements for native planting and other measures.</p>	
FS67.60	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Lacks specify of relief required for a submission and does not give effect to the NPS: FM or NPS: IB	Disallow	Accept
FS68.62	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose		Disallow	Accept
FS69.60	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose		Disallow	Accept
FS66.18	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose		Disallow	Accept
FS66.81	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose		Disallow	Accept
S561.003	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>The FNPDP currently does not include any reference to consideration of Notification. Kāinga Ora seeks the avoidance of unnecessary public notification of applications for resource consent. The reasons for this are threefold:</p> <p>a. Housing developments can be assessed against the residential outcomes stated within a District Plan without the need for wider public input.</p> <p>b. There is an urgent need to speed up the delivery of</p>	<p>Insert the following section in the 'How the Plan Works' section of the FNPDP or alternatively similar wording within each section of the Plan in reference to the Restricted Discretionary activities listed in the section. Alternatively this could be included in each chapter of the Proposed District Plan to assist with clarification. Notification: (1) Any application for resource consent for Restricted Discretionary activities will be considered without public or limited notification or the need to obtain the written approval from affected parties unless the Council decides that special circumstances exist under section 95A(9) of the Resource Management Act 1991:(2) Any application for resource consent for an activity listed as Discretionary or Non-complying will be subject to the normal tests for notification under the relevant sections of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				housing in the right places, supported by infrastructure and urban amenities and services. Resource consent notification processes can significantly delay delivery the delivery of new housing. c. Any effects generated by housing development are well understood and there is sufficient best practice to mitigate any adverse effects through a non-notified process.			
FS67.61	The Shooting Box Limited		Support in part	The submission is supported insofar as it applies to restricted discretionary activities where the activity is anticipated in the zone or overlay and where the scope of discretion is truly limited (such as buildings and dwellings in all zones and overlays which are primarily a design assessment and normal farming and land management practices such as earthworks and vegetation clearance in rural zones and overlays). It should not however apply to all restricted discretionary activities in the Plan, where the scope of discretion is often much wider and potentially of impact to third parties. Examples where it	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				shouldn't apply are Rural tourism Activity and Rural Industry in Rural Zones where impacts on neighbouring properties and the wider environment are at the core of the RDA assessment.			
FS143.55	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support		Allow		Reject
FS68.63	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part		Allow in part		Reject
FS69.61	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support		Allow		Reject
FS172.174	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support		Allow		Reject
FS66.82	Benzen Farm Limited		Support		Allow		Reject
FS32.057	Jeff Kemp		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS348.001	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS23.275	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
FS47.017	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the entire original submission	Accept
FS348.090	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose		Disallow	I seek that the whole of the	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						submission be disallowed	
S69.005	Robyn Josephine Baker	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	It is not acceptable for governmental policy that has never been formally voted on by the public to be forced on us by our elected council. We expect our elected council to be representing us by standing up for what we want and not to be acting as the governments' law enforcing officers.	Delete the PDP and replace it with a plan that has been drafted in true consultation with the citizens and rate payers of the area.		Reject
FS155.5	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
S215.052	Haigh Workman Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We have identified inconsistencies in the rules and standards for stormwater management: - between different zones in the District Plan; - between land use and subdivision; and - between the Proposed District Plan rules and Council's Engineering Standards (April 2022) This is largely because there are no specific objectives and policies in the Proposed District Plan relating to stormwater management. The Natural Hazards section has general objectives and policies relating to avoiding increasing flood risks, but there are no specific objectives on what needs	Insert a new chapter to the General District-Wide Matters addressing Stormwater Management (or Impermeable Surfaces generally) including overview, objectives, policies and rules in a similar way to the section on Earthworks management		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>to be achieved and policies on how it will be achieved. Some of these objectives are set out in Engineering Standards section 4.1.2, but the District Plan Objectives and Policies may need to include more than engineering issues. Stormwater management is proposed to be addressed in the District Plan through rules on Impermeable Surfaces in each zone as in the Operative District Plan. These rules also address landscaping / amenity issues, availability of land for wastewater disposal and natural hazard mitigation. The Proposed District Plan allows development up to the permitted activity levels without mitigation of adverse effects. The Matters of Discretion in the zone and subdivision rules provide no guidance on how stormwater is to be controlled when the standard is breached - is it intended for stormwater control to achieve the standards in the draft Engineering Standards (refer attached comments on Engineering Standards), attenuate stormwater to</p>			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>permitted activity levels (as in the Operative District Plan) or to pre-development levels, or simply to ensure there are no adverse effects off site (and if so, what adverse effects need to be addressed)?</p> <p>A consistent approach should be adopted for both land use and subdivision. For development that exceeds the impermeable surfaces thresholds and subdivision, we recommend that the District plan includes policies and rules similar to Regional Plan Rule C.6.4.2 (that is 'the diversion and discharge does not cause or increase flooding of land on another property in a storm event of up to and including a 10 percent annual exceedance probability, or flooding of buildings on another property in a storm event of up to and including a one percent annual exceedance probability').</p>			
FS155.7	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS177.1	Fred Terry		Support		Allow		Reject
FS177.2	Fred Terry		Support		Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS25.017	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Reject
FS309.1	Brad Hedger		Support in part		Allow in part		Reject
FS543.001	NRC Kerikeri/ Waipapa Rivers Working Group		Support in part		Allow in part	Insert a special Waipapa / Kerikeri Flood Hazard zone to recognise the development that has been established in the Waipapa flood plain and all associated downstream areas.	Reject
FS325.013	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.541	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.555	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.577	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S170.008	Alec Brian Cox	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Proposed Plan put out for submissions should be in a finished form as a legal document for the future, subject only to changes made as a result of submissions.	Amend the PDP to address the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment required for clarity; • Duplications; • Typing, some of which render the section meaningless; • Failure to follow standard numbering layout; • Inconsistencies; • Omission of key data such as SNAs; • Mapped zones are not in agreement with zone definitions; and • Section 32 Reports require revision to realistic figures. 	Accept in part
FS155.18	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS172.246	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS566.497	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Accept in part Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission
S547.011	LJ King Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitter considers that while the Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you	Reject
FS155.26	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Reject
S543.011	LJ King Limited	General / Plan	Support in part	The submitter considers that while that the Council	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Stop telling your community what the government has	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Content / Miscellaneous		is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you		
FS155.28	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS566.2172	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S425.010	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	As a primary submission, PHTTCCT continues to seek that the Trail be mapped in the plan and re-submits the Pou Herenga Tai Cycle Trail Overlay Chapter (see Attachment 2) which includes provisions that seek to: - Recognise and provide for the Trail in acknowledgement of the social, economic and environmental benefits it provides to the District as acknowledged by its classification as regionally significant infrastructure; - Enable appropriate activities, including the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of the Trail;	Insert the Pou Herenga Tai Cycle Trail Overlay Chapter (see Attachment 2) which includes provisions that seek to: - Recognise and provide for the Trail in acknowledgement of the social, economic and environmental benefits it provides to the District as acknowledged by its classification as regionally significant infrastructure; - Enable appropriate activities, including the maintenance, operation, and upgrade of the Trail; and - Manage reverse sensitivity effects.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage reverse sensitivity effects. <p>PHTTCCT considers that this request is appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the regionally significant economic, social, and environmental benefits associated with the Pou Herenga Tai Trail which are further set out in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, mapping it in the Plan with an associated suite of provisions (as provided in Attachment 2 or to same effect) would be the most efficient and effective way to ensure these benefits are protected, continued and enhanced; - The overlay and associated provisions promote the sustainable management of the physical resources; - The overlay and associated provisions are consistent with Part 2 of the RMA; - The overlay and associated provisions are appropriate in terms of section 32 of the RMA; - The overlay and associated provisions represent an efficient use and development of physical resources which have received significant investment; - The overlay and 		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				associated provision sought appropriately avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment; and - The overlay and associated provision are consistent with the balance of the PDP, in particular the Strategic Direction section of the Plan.		
FS299.3	KiwiRail Holdings Limited		Oppose		Disallow	Accept
FS107.3	Laurell Douglas		Support		Allow	Reject
S498.014	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngāpuhi	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The submitter considers that the RMA defines effect to include positive, adverse, cumulative and other effects, all of equal importance. While the PDP has adopted this definition, many of its provisions single out adverse effects only for consideration, without reference to positive effects. This has the potential to constrain the development of Māori land, because the positive effects of development are to be given only secondary consideration.	Amend any plan provisions requiring specific consideration of adverse effects, either by deleting the word "adverse" by adding equal references to positive and cumulative effects.	Reject
FS151.54	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Reject
FS196.227	Joe Carr		Support in part		Allow in part	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.182	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Reject
S120.001	Lynley Newport	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitter considers there is an overuse of the word "avoid" throughout the objectives and policies. The objectives and policies are dominated by the use of negative language where a simple change of language could turn negativity to positivity that will still achieve the environmental outcomes sought.	Amend objectives and policies that start with the word "avoid" to see if the negative restrictive language can be replaced with more enabling language.		Reject
FS172.204	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.1	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject
FS196.76	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject
FS332.223	Russell Protection Society		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
S283.011	Trent Simpkin	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	An overall comment - A new District Plan doesn't mean just including a whole realm of new rules to further control anything someone wants to do on their piece of land. The PDP is clearly going to result in hundreds (if not thousands) of additional Resource Consents required for even the	Delete and amend all rules, by looking at them and asking the question - are we actually going to achieve anything by processing hundreds of resource consents for this rule - if not - exclude it. Alternatively, offer a permitted pathway around them (with consultant reports) to reduce the number of resource consents needed.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>smallest activity. Skimming through the rules and associating it with simply building a home - many, many more projects are going to be breaching one rule or another. This adds I would estimate \$10,000 to any home build, by the time a planning report is done, other supporting documents are sought and the council fees for processing are paid. The entire district is being choked by FNDC's inability to process Resource Consents in a timely manner, and we're waiting the best part of a year to finally get Resource Consents issued. New rules resulting in more resource consents will increase the volume of resource consents - making the processing times even worse.</p>			
FS172.281	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS570.825	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.839	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
FS569.861	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S483.186	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Clarity around integration between chapter is a critical component to usability. Top Energy seeks that it be made clear in the How the Plan Works Chapter which rules take precedence, or where users should be directed to refer to the relevant notes within the relevant Chapter.	Amend to clarify which rules take precedence, or where users should be directed to refer to the relevant notes within the relevant Chapter.		Accept in part
FS196.226	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS345.237	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S359.007	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We recommend that land use provisions be tested to ensure there are no undue impediments to climate change mitigation (e.g. amenity-based rules on 'reflectivity', building height or similar that unduly limit opportunities for small to medium scale solar or wind generation).	Amend land use provisions where they are an impediment to climate change mitigation (eg. amenity-based rules on 'reflectivity', building height or similar that unduly limit opportunities for small to medium scale solar or wind generation) (inferred).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS25.051	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Reject
FS23.097	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought by making changes to make appropriate provision for climate change	Reject
FS243.001	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS325.031	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Reject
FS570.1043	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.468	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1057	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1079	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S359.008	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The actions set out in the Te Taitokerau Climate Adaptation Strategy should guide development of climate change provisions within the Plan	Amend the climate change provisions where required to have regard to the Te Taitokerau Climate Adaptation Strategy (inferred)		Reject
FS25.052	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent of providing direction that provides a clear statement of how communities will respond to climate change.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate wording.	Reject
FS23.098	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought by making changes to make appropriate provision for climate change	Reject
FS325.032	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Reject
FS570.1044	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.469	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.						
FS566.1058	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1080	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S359.022	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Recommend strengthening reverse sensitivity provisions, especially where lifestyle/rural residential development occurs within or adjoins Rural Production, mineral extraction, Industrial zones and significant infrastructure.	Amend to include stronger reverse sensitivity provisions. Provisions to consider appropriate visual and physical screening and limitations on intensity of noise sensitive activities		Reject
FS25.088	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Greenfield development is a more appropriate and more cost-effective way of meeting housing demands. Retrofitting networks to service infill development can be problematic and costly, particularly where existing development has already established infrastructure.	Allow	Allow original submission to the extent that hazard prone areas are correctly identified and mapped and that there are appropriate consent triggers that enable more detailed assessment in appropriate circumstances.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS36.0010	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS374.046	Waipapa Pine Limited		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS325.062	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.1058	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.483	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1072	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1094	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S222.001	Wendover Two Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	As described in the National Planning Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows		Insert a new clause specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped. While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole. While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole. In addition to the above, the following part of the explanation is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the provisions relating to an activity. For example, residential activity may not be provided for in the overlay, but is provided for in the underlying zoning: "Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				there are no overlay rules that are applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone)".			
FS446.003	Omata Estate		Support	Support. Overlays and their associated rules should apply only to the part of the site that is mapped. This is required to ensure a clear robust planning framework and so users of the Plan are clear as to which provisions apply to specific land areas.	Allow	Insert a new clause specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay.	Reject
FS547.004	Heron Point Limited		Support		Allow	Allow	Reject
FS305.004	Dempsey Family Trust		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S449.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP has several significant weaknesses that make it difficult to achieve the intended overall objectives. The rules/standard for permitted activities address limited matters, containing insufficient rules/standards relating to environmental values.	Amend PDP to: - provide clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities. - reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word 'avoid' should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially. - incorporate additional rules to protect the environment and amenity values, and to address climate change issues relevant to the types of activities.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>The PDP frequently defaults to 'discretionary activity' status. This means the proposal should be considered by developers and council planners on the basis of PDP objectives and policies. However, many of the policies are written in vague terms that are open to wide interpretation. We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.</p>			
<p>FS446.013</p>	<p>Omata Estate</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support in principle subject to appropriate wording and mapping including robust assessment for determining the most appropriate activity status.</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Amend PDP to: - provide clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities. - reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word 'avoid' should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially. - incorporate additional rules to protect the environment and amenity values, and to address</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
					climate change issues relevant to the types of activities.		
FS243.240	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose		Disallow in part	Amend to rezone from Rural Residential Zone to General Residential Zone for all properties accessed from The Ridge, Kerikeri 0230 (refer to Attachment 2 of the submission)	Reject
FS569.1800	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1817	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow		Reject
S483.025	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally. This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan.	Amend implementation advice notes across the plan to ensure consistency		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS78.034	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter support this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS351.007	A.W and D.M Simpson		Oppose		Disallow	Do not adopt new objective as proposed by Top energy.	Accept
FS371.007	Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa, Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoru, Ngati Rahiri		Oppose		Disallow	Do not adopt new objective as proposed by Top energy.	Accept
FS449.007	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose		Disallow	Do not adopt new objective as proposed by Top energy.	Accept
FS345.076	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept
S483.194	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The Overlay chapters are one example and are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter", consistent with zone chapters.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Works chapter includes a statement that indicates some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity, however resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). Some Chapters include notes which provide some clarity in this regard (e.g. Heritage Overlay) however this isn't consistently applied through the overlays or the District Wide Chapters generally. Some overlays include a catch all 'activities not otherwise specified' activity status (e.g. Treaty Settlement Land Overlay). Some overlays don't. This lack of consistency (coupled with inconsistent terminology) will cause confusion for Plan users and ultimately, impact the integrity of the plan. This is particularly relevant in the Overlay chapters where each Overlay chapter has a different approach to activity status default rules. With specific regard to the permitted activity default, it is noted that this could</p>			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				lead unintentional consequences.			
FS78.040	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter support this submission because it will improve the clarity of the proposed plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS345.245	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Reject
S335.006	BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, Z Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Fuel Companies are concerned that no objectives and policies relating to contaminated land are included in the PDP. A contaminated land policy framework is particularly important for consideration of NES-CS consents, noting that the NES-CS does not contain objectives and policies. In terms of rules, the Fuel Companies consider that the NES-CS provides appropriate land use controls in relation to both land disturbance and changes of use in relation to contaminated soils and therefore supports the PDP having no rules in relation to contaminated land.	Insert a new Contaminated Land Chapter CL-01 Contaminated land is identified and managed so that it remains acceptable and safe for human health and its intended use. CL-P1 Identify contaminated land prior to subdivision, change of use or development by: 1. Working with Northland Regional Council to maintain the Selected Land-use Register; and 2. Requiring the investigation of contaminant risks for sites with a history of land use or activity that could have resulted in contamination of soil. CL-P2 Minimise the risk to human health from the subdivision, change of use or specified development of contaminated land by: 1. Requiring a good practice approach to site management of contaminated land; 2. Ensuring the land is safe for its intended use.		Accept in part
FS354.002	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter identifies that there is no contaminated land chapter in the Plan. While the	Allow	Allow S335.006 to include provision for contaminated land.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				NESCS provides the framework for managing contaminated land this can be assisted by an objective and policy framework in the Plan as sought by the submitter.			
S431.071	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Reference correction	Delete references in the Plan to 'Moturua Island zone' and 'Motoura Island zone', and replace with 'Moturoa Island zone'		Accept
FS332.071	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
S522.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.	Amend PDP to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities. reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word 'avoid' should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially to meet today's expectations and standards. avoid undesirable activities by classifying as non-complying or prohibited, instead of discretionary. additional rules to protect the environment and amenity values, and address climate change issues relevant to the types of activities covered by district plans 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS62.002	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS277.22	Jenny Collison		Support		Allow		Reject
FS566.1740	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.008	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.	Amend the PDP to incorporate a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.		Reject
FS277.25	Jenny Collison		Support	To support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Reject
FS566.1747	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.009	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content /	Support in part	The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial contributions (chapter 14).	Amend the PDP to include provisions for meaningful development contributions to address the need for, and cost of, infrastructure [inferred].		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Miscellaneous		However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden.			
FS277.26	Jenny Collison		Support	To support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Reject
FS566.1748	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.021	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	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
FS277.31	Jenny Collison		Support	So often green space is an afterthought, inadequate, poorly planned and maintained	Allow		Reject
FS566.1760	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S338.001	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The PDP has several significant weaknesses that make it difficult to achieve the intended overall objectives. The rules/standard for permitted activities address limited matters, containing insufficient rules/standards relating to	Amend the PDP to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide clear criteria for assessing discretionary activities. reduce the ambiguities in policies, the word 'avoid' should be applied more often, and other phrasing should be clarified and strengthened substantially. 		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				environmental values. The PDP frequently defaults to 'discretionary activity' status. This means the proposal should be considered by developers and council planners on the basis of PDP objectives and policies. However, many of the policies are written in vague terms that are open to wide interpretation. We are concerned that the PDP, as currently drafted, would support development in a form that undermines character, amenity values and other aspects of the environment that our communities value.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> incorporate additional rules to protect the environment and amenity values, and to address climate change issues relevant to the types of activities. 	
FS277.33	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Our Kerikeri submission	Allow	Reject
FS570.942	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS566.956	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
FS569.978	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Reject
S338.050	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	No specific reason for this decision sought	Amend the PDP wherever possible to 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
FS277.41	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for liveable communities	Allow	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.988	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1002	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1024	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S354.002	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To address the concerns detailed in the BOI Watchdog submission about councils' practices, implementation of district plans and supporting practice notes. To enable the group and dog owners to understand the impact on dog ownership and to enable them then to discuss issues / concerns with Council. Refer to full submission.	Amend all documentation in the PDP to ensure that it meets the above motherhood statement, so that elements which may impact dogs and dog owners can be clearly identified to Council.		Reject
FS570.1011	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1025	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1047	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
S354.003	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	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.	Require of FNDC management that regular hui be held with dog owners, and that the purpose of those meetings is for senior staff to listen to the community, and to begin to re-build trust, and working relationships. At least one elected member should consistently attend these meetings.		Reject
FS570.1012	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1026	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1048	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.004	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To help with animal welfare needs, and reduce the number of animals having to be euthanized. Refer to submission for full details.	Direct FNDC management to work with local animal rescue services immediately, to help them in this crisis period, not hinder them. This should include consideration of emergency funding to cope with the increase in the number of dogs needing rehoming, access to free EAP services, funding for de-sexing dogs across the rohe, and infrastructure so they can help residents who have to relinquish dogs (in part, due to FNDC's own actions over the last two decades).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1013	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1027	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1049	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.005	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To appropriately manage animal welfare, as well as providing for the safety of communities. Refer to submission for full details.	Review and consider mandatory de-sexing and breeder regulations.		Reject
FS570.1014	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1028	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1050	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept

Hearings Panel Recommendation – Recommendation Report 1

Appendix 3.1 Recommended Decisions on Submissions – Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions

31/03/2026

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S354.007	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To address how the group members, local rescue groups and dog owners have been treated by Council and the lack of transparency over the banning and restricting of dogs when processing resource consents. Refer to full submission.	Apologise for FNDC management's history of obfuscation and secrecy around the banning and restricting of dogs in our community.		Reject
FS570.1016	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1030	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1052	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.009	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To address the concerns, detailed in the BOI Watchdog submission about Council, staff and its processes and resource management practices over pet ownership. Refer	Instruct FNDC management to encourage, facilitate and resource dog owners and environmentalists to work together in our own local communities to find local solutions to any issues.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to the submission for full details.			
FS570.1018	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1032	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1054	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.010	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	To address past grievances over the Dog Tax Wars of 1898 and to recognise the high percentage of dog ownership in Maori households.	Insert into the District Plan (inferred) that consultation around dog management always occurs with iwi and hapu, particularly those in the Hokianga, whose family members and ancestors were directly harmed by the Dog Tax Wars of 1898.		Reject
FS570.1019	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1033	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
FS569.1055	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.011	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	What is good for the goose, should be good for the gander. Examples of this are the Council Horeke Pound and Donna Doolittle facility and the application of the definition of kennels in the operative district plan. Refer to the full submission.	Direct FNDC management to abide by its own rules and regulations.		Reject
FS570.1020	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1034	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1056	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.012	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan	Support	This is a need to protect the current and future	Review the culture and functioning of the Animal Management Department, from the bottom up, with		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Content / Miscellaneous		frontline staff. It is such a tough job, and they deserve support and safety. It is also required due to the sexist culture in this department. Refer to full submission for details.	protection for whistle-blowers inside and outside the council. Review every complaint over the last five years. Consult the community.		
FS570.1021	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1035	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1057	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.013	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Misuse of the Public Works Act has occurred, as perhaps demonstrated by the case in the purchase of Melka Kennels in Kaikohe. Refer to full submission.	Direct FNDC Management that the use of the Public Works Act by FNDC be more judicious, and subject to regular, quick, oversight by the elected Council, so that it is not used to bully residents, or obtain unfair financial advantage over people in our community.		Reject
FS570.1022	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1036	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1058	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.014	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	This should go some way to reduce the imbalance between volunteer community member input, and that of large organisations who have paid lobbyists writing their responses (e.g. DOC, Farmers Federation, Forest and Bird).	Amend FNDC consultation processes, to work out how to better ensure that all our community members genuinely understand documentation and can contribute fully. In addition, provide funding for residents and community groups to get professional support when consultations are very complex.		Reject
FS570.1023	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1037	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1059	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
S354.015	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Dog ownership has many benefits, and it is something the majority of the community want to be able to do. There has been no evidence provided that demonstrates that dogs are impacting adversely on the districts biodiversity and it appears to be management requiring this vs good resource management practices. Refer to full submission for details.	Delete any reference in Part 2, District Wide Matters, Strategic Direction, Economic, and social wellbeing: all social prosperity objectives, and Natural Environment: SDEP06 that would limit dog ownership.		Reject
FS570.1024	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1038	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1060	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.016	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content /	Oppose	Dogs are not pests.	Delete any section in the Plan which mentions dogs as pests (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Miscellaneous					
FS570.1025	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1039	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1061	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.017	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Plan should not restrict dog ownership and dogs to not impact adversely on biodiversity (inferred).	Delete any sections of the Plan which state the aim is to "Encourage and support active management of pest plants and animals" or "Require landowners to manage pets and pest species to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species."		Reject
FS570.1026	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1040	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1062	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S354.027	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Plain language is being encouraged by central government. The Proposed District Plan took staff years to devise, yet we had 12 weeks to wad through it. The stack of printed documents for us to consider is taller than some of our dogs. We fear missing some clauses, or policies, or practice notes which might further harm our right to live in Northland with our furry family members.	Amend the Proposed District Plan to be written in plain language (inferred)		Reject
FS570.1036	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1050	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1072	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
S529.008	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.	Amend the PDP to incorporate a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.		Reject
FS570.1898	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1912	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1934	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.013	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial contributions (chapter 14). However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development	Amend the PDP to require development contributions when Council has adopted policy on development contributions as part of its Long Term Plan (Inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden.			
FS570.1903	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1917	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1939	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.033	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	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
FS570.1923	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1937	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1959	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.111	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	When considering the effects of a proposed activity, s3 of the RMA states that the term effect 'includes ... any cumulative effect which arises over time or in combination with other effects ...' The Regional Policy Statement for Northland, Policy 5.1.1 states that	Amend relevant part of the DP to specifically recognize the need to identify and address any cumulative effect and potential cumulative effects, and require sufficient information to assess potential long term effects of the proposed activity on the environment		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'Subdivision, use and development should be located, designed and built in a planned and co-ordinated manner which... Recognises and addresses potential cumulative effects of subdivision, use, and development, and is based on sufficient information to allow assessment of the potential long-term effects.' When considering proposed subdivision, land use and development, the DP needs to address potential cumulative effects and potential long-term effects on the environment.			
FS570.1999	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2013	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2035	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.112	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP does not give full and proper effect to the RMA provisions S74(1) s6 s7 s31	Amend the PDP policies to implement key principals and obligations of the RMA		Reject
FS570.2000	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2014	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2036	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.113	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP does not give full and proper effect to the RMA provisions S74(1) s6 s7 s31	Amend the PDP rules to strengthen the key principles and obligations of the RMA		Reject
FS570.2001	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2015	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2037	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S483.185	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The 'How the Plan Works' Chapter should include direction regarding split-zoning	Insert direction regarding split zoning		Reject
FS345.236	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
S170.001	Alec Brian Cox	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	"The District Plan controls the way land is used, developed and subdivided and is a requirement under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The purpose of the	Delete the Plan, review and redesign so that all rules which contain limits provide for the activity to be prohibited if the final limit is breached.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources." The above statement provides the target against which the draft Plan must be assessed as Fit for Purpose. At a superficial view one may form the impression that the draft District Plan provides objectives, policies and rules to control the way land is used, developed and subdivided. However to anyone familiar with the RMA process, the plan will fail to meet these targets. Thus the draft Plan must be considered as not being Fit for Purpose. The main reason for this failure stems directly from the RMA criteria that only Prohibited activities are not allowed. Any other classification will be argued for by a developer and may be granted, possibly with conditions.</p>			
<p>FS566.490</p>	<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust 2</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Reject</p>
<p>S170.005</p>	<p>Alec Brian Cox</p>	<p>General / Plan Content /</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The Plan framework considers matters as being either District-wide or relating to specific</p>	<p>Amend by transferring or rewriting rules which are zone dependent from District-wide sections to the relevant zones.</p>		<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Miscellaneous		identified areas with common features. Unfortunately the detail below these headings fails to follow that idea. Some District wide items like subdivision are broken down into zone specific rulings which should be in the area section. Conversely provisions for Maori customary purposes which fit the overlay structure are classed as an area matter, fragmenting natural area groups purely on the basis of ownership structure. A number of Special Purpose zones are only separated as they have existing resource consents.			
FS566.494	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	Awaiting recommendation
S170.006	Alec Brian Cox	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Plan framework considers matters as being either District-wide or relating to specific identified areas with common features. Unfortunately, the detail below these headings fails to follow that idea. Some District wide items like subdivision are broken down into zone specific	Delete zoning from areas defined by existing resource consent and rezone accordingly to the approved activity (inferred).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rulings which should be in the area section. Conversely provisions for Māori customary purposes which fit the overlay structure are classed as an area matter, fragmenting natural area groups purely on the basis of ownership structure. A number of Special Purpose zones are only separated as they have existing resource consents.			
FS566.495	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
S464.011	LJ King Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The submitters considers that while Council is required by the government to give effect to higher policy documents, in essence they are also supposed to represent the needs and wants of ratepayers and the community back up to government.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Stop telling your community what the government has said they have to do, and start fighting for your community. Otherwise, you are just puppets of the government, and not our representatives. Get out of the way of your community and let us achieve desirable outcomes the way we do it, not in a way dictated to us by a bunch of bureaucrats in Wellington who have probably never been here, experienced the way our community works, and certainly not walked on our land. Facilitate, don't force. Maybe then your community might actually start to value and respect you.		Reject
FS566.1556	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	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
S527.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	When considering proposed subdivision, land use and development, the DP needs to address potential cumulative effects and potential long-term effects on the environment. This has implications for many topics covered by the DP, including Ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity, Natural character, Natural features and landscapes, Zones, etc.	Amend the PDP to specifically recognise the need to identify and address any cumulative effect and potential cumulative effects, and require sufficient information to assess potential long-term effects of the proposed activity on the environment.	Reject	
FS566.1863	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S527.002	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	We consider that the proposed DP does not give full and proper effect to the RMA provisions. Concerned that positive environmental objectives should not be balanced against economic development. This has fostered a trade-off approach, where the environment always loses out. Ideally, a DP should pursue synergies rather than balancing trade-offs, i.e. good outcomes should be pursued in ways that also achieve other good outcomes.	Amend the PDP policies and rules to strengthen and implement key principles and obligations.	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1864	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S539.001	Mauri-crown-tane	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Legalese is a language fully understood by lawyers, barristers and judges unsuitable for Maori speaking people and should be provided in plain language where words such as submission yield authority to the council is not in the best interest of any land owners.	Delete the Far North District Councils' "Proposed District Plan" also known as PDP, this rejection is inclusive of any provisions, maps and each chapter that is supported by the provisions of a section 32 analysis.		Reject
S449.009	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.	Amend the PDP to incorporate a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.		Reject
FS569.1808	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1825	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S449.014	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Operative DP contains a chapter on development financial contributions (chapter 14). However, some years ago the council eliminated most requirements for development contributions. This has resulted in a large accumulated shortfall in infrastructure and related funding, and ratepayers are unfairly expected to carry this cost burden.	Amend the PDP to require development contributions when Council has adopted policy on development contributions as part of its Long Term Plan (Inferred)	Reject
FS569.1813	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1830	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Reject
S449.034	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	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
FS569.1833	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1850	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Reject
S449.041	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Currently the resource consenting process can take six months and is very frustrating for many applicants. We consider the process should be made clearer and simpler, while at the same time containing appropriate rules and policies that will protect and enhance our urban and natural environments and other things that our	Amend resource consent system to have a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				communities value. We believe the council should consider introducing a two-queue system, comprising one queue for applications for small simple minor works by the general public, and a separate queue for other larger or more complex applications. We believe that two separate queues for processing applications could prevent simple minor works being held up by larger or more complex applications.		
FS569.1840	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject
FS570.1857	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Reject
S368.046	Far North District Council	Contents	Support in part	Reference to 'contaminated land' in the Contents needs to be removed as it is not a chapter in the PDP	Delete the reference to 'contaminated land' in the contents chapter of the PDP	Reject
S390.004	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Purpose	Support in part	The submitter considers that as a Treaty partner, Te Rūnanga o Ngai Takoto (inferred) is a strategic partner and should be considered as a priority within Council's strategic relationship matrix.	Insert provisions in the PDP in relation to Māori land parcels (inferred) that straddle Council boundaries to harmonise with district plans of neighbouring authorities by creating special zones or precincts across boundaries or delegations of powers by Councils.	Reject
S486.051	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Purpose	Oppose	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa would like the name 'He Whenua Rangatira' removed. We seek clarity as to the reasoning behind Councils choice to use a Māori	Remove the Māori name 'He Whenua Rangatira'	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				name for its 80 year long plan yet demonstrates little regard to rangatiratanga o ngā iwi me ngā hapū o tēnei whenua.			
S390.038	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the 'He Whenua Rangatira', as used in FN2100 and referred to the the PDP and seeks clarity as to the reasoning behind Councils choice to use a Māori name for its 80 year long plan yet demonstrates little regard to rangatiratanga o ngā iwi me ngā hapū o tēnei whenua.	Amend the proposed plan to remove He Whenua Rangatira as used in the plan and reference to FN2100.		Reject
S498.039	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the 'He Whenua Rangatira', as used in FN2100 and referred to the the PDP and seeks clarity as to the reasoning behind Councils choice to use a Māori name for its 80 year long plan yet demonstrates little regard to rangatiratanga o ngā iwi me ngā hapū o tēnei whenua.	Amend the proposed plan to remove He Whenua Rangatira as used in the plan and reference to FN2100.		Reject
FS151.81	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS151.82	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.207	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						with our primary submission	
S573.006	Te Kawariki me Te Wānanga o Te Rangi Aniwaniwa	Description of the District	Not Stated	FAR NORTH DISTRICT (2018 CENSUS) - Number of People - 65,250 Number of Maori 31,503 NZ Stats higher than 50% (refer to submission for numbers by area)	Retain the following statement/fourth paragraph (inferred) - The ethnic composition of the Far North District has some notable differences when compared to New Zealand as a whole. It has significantly more people who identify as Māori, and less who identify as belonging to European, Pacific peoples and Asian ethnic groups[2] . In some small areas, like Moerewa and Kaikohe, the proportion is much higher at around 65%.		Accept
S349.002	Neil Construction Limited	Significant Resource Management Issues	Oppose	A better outcome for the submitters land 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 or amend 'significant resource management issue' in Part 1 of the PDP to signal the need to make further provision for additional rural residential capacity		Reject
FS62.036	Kapiro Conservation Trust 1		Oppose		Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
FS333.023	Maree Hart		Oppose		Disallow	Re-zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 (tubbs farmland) in Rural Production or Horticulture zone etc	Accept
S559.053	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Significant Resource Management Issues	Oppose	Submitter agrees with all the issues raised in the Significant Resource Management Issues	Insert a new Significant Resource Management Issue for water resilience and reliable water supply.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				section, however notes that water resilience and reliable water supply is missing from the list of significant issues and needs to be incorporated into this section.		
S559.054	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rehia	Significant Resource Management Issues	Support	Submitter agrees with the Significant Resource Management Issues raised within the Description of the District section.	Retain the existing Significant Resource Management Issues as notified	Accept in part
S486.053	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Significant Resource Management Issue 1	Oppose	Partnerships is not a resource management issue identified by Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa.	Amend and replace Partnerships with the word Relationships	Accept
S486.054	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Significant Resource Management Issue 1	Oppose	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa objects that Council has focused on legislation, Māori land tenure and Māori land development issues as to the reason why Council has had difficulty in building strong relationships with iwi and hapū. Instead, we believe political unwillingness and the lack of understanding, recognition and the application given to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and He Whakaputanga are the major concerns.	Amend to identify issues Council has, forming relationships with iwi and hapū	Reject
S421.002	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Significant Resource Management Issue 2	Oppose	While supporting the inclusion of a significant resource management issue addressing the rural environment, Federated	Amend Issue 2 Rural sustainability as follows: The Rural Environment contains a number of There are competing demands for a range of land use activities in the Rural Environment. A The previous permissive planning framework has resulted led, in some areas,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Farmers does not support the issue as it is currently drafted.</p> <p>While rural sustainability is a valid resource management issue, it needs to be approached from a holistic perspective and not only focus on the adverse effects that can result from some land use activities in the rural environment.</p> <p>Rural sustainability must include the protection of the existing land use activities such as primary production which have been present and operating in the rural environment for many years, if not decades.</p> <p>Primary production makes a substantial contribution to New Zealand's economy across national, regional and district levels.</p> <p>The current wording of the issue is clumsy and is not easy to understand. The issue needs to be amended so that it is clear what the issue is and what is trying to be achieved.</p>	<p>to in incompatible land uses, land fragmentation and significant adverse effects on rural character, amenity and indigenous biodiversity. In some cases, highly productive land (which includes including versatile soils) have been used in such a way that compromises the future viability of primary production activities, such as horticulture and agriculture has been compromised. and These uses have also inappropriately used existing infrastructure and services. The current Rural Production Zone has applied a single set of provisions to the majority of the District, which This approach does has not addressed the specific issues faced by in the different rural areas and their communities. It is also important that the District Plan clearly reflects that rural settlements differ in their ability to access the infrastructure and services available in urban centres.</p>	
FS24.1	Lynley Newport		Support in part	<p>A one-size fits all approach to the Rural Production zoning and associated provisions is not sustainable and contrary to national policy framework direction.</p>	Allow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS354.023	Horticulture New Zealand		Support		Allow	Allow S421.002	Accept in part
FS570.1234	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.236	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1248	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1270	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S477.004	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	Significant Resource Management Issue 3	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S477.005	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	Significant Resource Management Issue 4	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences	Reject
S477.006	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	Significant Resource Management Issue 6	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences	Reject
S477.007	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	Significant Resource Management Issue 9	Not Stated	As Kaitiaki, we are and have been acutely aware of the degradation of Papatuanuku (Earth mother) and all living things between her and Ranginui (Sky Father) and the unavoidable consequences that can be generally categorised as Climate Change issues since pre-colonial times until present.	Amend the Plan as required to be forward-thinking regarding climate-related issues as the geography of our rohe makes us more susceptible to these issues and their potentially dire consequences	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S394.001	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Te Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) and the RMA	Oppose	The third paragraph is inaccurate. Council has not worked in partnership with Haititaimarangi Marae in developing the Proposed Plan. Article 2 Te Tiriti o Waitangi guarantees tino rangatiratanga to hapu. The principle of protection extends to active protection of hapū tino rangatiratanga. 'Iwi authorities' recognised by Council do not represent all hapū. It is an oxymoron to cite the Treaty principles while only consulting 'iwi authorities'.	Amend the second sentence of the third paragraph of 'The Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) and the RMA' section as follows: Far North District Council along with its recognised eleven iwi authorities and some these hapū groups it has memorandums of understanding with have worked in partnership to develop the Far North District Plan in accordance with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.	Accept in part
FS104.1	Karena Hita		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS174.001	Ruby-Anne Reihana		Support		Allow	Accept in part
FS363.001	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part
FS538.001	Awhina Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part
FS537.001	Maryanne June Harrison		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part
FS536.001	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part
FS535.001	Dyrell Akavi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part
FS533.001	Sidney John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS532.001	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS531.001	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS530.001	Norma Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS529.001	Aaron Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS528.001	Erana Samuels		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS527.001	David Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS526.001	Michelle Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS525.001	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS524.001	Tania Morunga		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS523.001	Brett Larkin		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS522.001	Stacey Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS521.001	Marie Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS520.001	Maureen Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS519.001	Huia Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS518.001	William Boyd Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS517.001	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS516.001	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS515.001	Anaru Poharama		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS514.001	Robert Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS513.001	Ester Rangī Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS512.001	Ellen Appleby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS511.001	Cedric Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS510.001	Raniera Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS509.001	Clinton Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS508.001	Sana Ryan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS507.001	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS506.001	Selwyn Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS505.001	Thomson Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS504.001	Ngarei Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS503.001	Nina Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS502.001	Rebecca Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS501.001	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS500.001	Whetu Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS499.001	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS498.001	Aaron George Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS497.001	Tayla Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS496.001	Cheryl Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS495.001	Jasmine Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS494.001	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS493.001	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS492.001	Sarah Kati Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS491.001	Mark J Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS490.001	Julia Middleton		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS489.001	Josephine Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS487.001	Timothy Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS486.001	John Barry Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS485.001	Travis Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS483.001	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS482.001	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS481.001	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS480.001	Cheryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS479.001	Jacob Hohaia		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS478.001	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS477.001	Chase McIndoe		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS476.001	Jessica Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS475.001	Marina Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS474.001	Steven Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS473.001	Beryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS472.001	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS471.001	William Gary Butt		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS470.001	Michael Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS469.001	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS468.001	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS467.001	Carol Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS466.001	Janet Myra Bennett		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS465.001	Rangimarie Muru		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS464.001	Glennis Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS463.001	Jayden Murray		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS462.001	Roharia Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS461.001	Vincent C Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS460.001	Tawhai Motu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS459.001	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS458.001	Alexander John Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS457.001	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS456.001	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS455.001	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS454.001	Turei John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS453.001	Marlaine Ulrich		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS452.001	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS451.001	Ariana Bellingham		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS450.001	Georgina Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS447.001	Rangaunu Taua		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS440.001	Hongi Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS439.001	Rahera Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS436.001	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS435.001	George Hori Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS434.001	Anthony Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS433.001	Christian Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS432.001	Makarita Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS431.001	Valarie Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS430.001	Kaeo Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS429.001	Cedrick Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS428.001	Shane Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS427.001	Jacey Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS426.001	Toni Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS425.001	Florence Campbell		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS423.001	Joseph Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS422.001	Sharmaine Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS421.001	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS420.001	Josephine Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS418.001	Mary Watkins		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS417.001	Maddison Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS416.001	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS415.001	Michelle Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS408.001	Jason Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS388.001	Crystal Myra Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS387.001	Aroha Whitinui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS386.001	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS385.001	Victoria Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS382.001	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS381.001	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS380.001	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS379.001	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS378.001	Maanu Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS365.001	Roberta Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS360.001	Cameron Mccaskill		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS359.001	Mark Brannen		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS358.001	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS357.001	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS356.001	Katharine Kino		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS568.001	Bonnie Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS567.001	Blaze Maraki		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS563.001	Hohepa Fletcher		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS562.001	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS561.001	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS560.001	Dylan Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS559.001	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS558.001	Timothy John Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS557.001	Patricia Kate Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS556.001	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS555.001	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS553.001	Kenape Saupese		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS552.001	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS551.001	Alamein Drummond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS546.001	Shona Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS545.001	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS544.001	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS178.001	Hera Johns		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS413.001	Charles Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S511.018	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Format of chapters in Part 2 and Part 3	Support in part	The relationship between the provisions and rules in the zone chapters and the district wide chapter is not clearly explained. This could result in plan users focusing on zone provisions and failure to consider the overlay provisions for indigenous biodiversity. It would be helpful to include a statement with respect to zone/area specific chapter provision to clarify that the district wide provisions also apply. That with respect to rules it is the more stringent rule that applies.	Amend the last sentence of the reference to 'Zones' in 'Part 3 - Area Specific Matters' as follows: Area specific-zone matters chapters do not contain rules and standards that apply generally across the district specifically to the area or zone. There are additional rules and standards which apply generally across the district in the District Wide Matters chapters. This may result in more than one rule applying to an activity, in which case the more stringent will apply. And Add Where there is a conflict between the provisions in an area specific matters chapter and a provision for an overlay in a district wide matters chapter that cannot be resolved by carefully considering the wording of the provisions, it is the district wide overlay provision which prevails.		Accept in part
FS67.31	The Shooting Box Limited		Support in part	The clarification sought by the submitter is agreed with, apart from the reference to where there is conflict then the district-wide provisions prevail. That is not the structure of the Plan which requires the more restrictive or more particular provision to apply where there is	Disallow in part		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conflict between the provisions.			
FS68.34	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part		Disallow in part		Accept
FS69.33	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support in part		Disallow in part		Accept
FS66.52	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part		Disallow in part		Accept
FS111.005	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept
FS164.018	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support		Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Accept in part
FS369.026	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in par the original submission	Accept
FS403.038	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	
FS404.087	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1589	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1603	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1625	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.038	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Format of chapters in Part 2 and Part 3	Not Stated	The relationship between the provisions and rules in the zone chapters and the district wide chapter is not clearly explained. This could result in plan users focusing on zone provisions and failure to consider the overlay provisions for indigenous biodiversity. It would be helpful to include a statement with respect to zone/area specific chapter provision to clarify that the	Amend the last sentence of the reference to 'Zones' in 'Part 3 - Area Specific Matters' as follows: Area specific zone matters chapters do not contain rules and standards that apply generally across the district specifically to the area or zone. There are additional rules and standards which apply generally across the district in the District Wide Matters chapters. This may result in more than one rule applying to an activity, in which case the more stringent will apply. And insert Where there is a conflict between the provisions in an area specific matters chapter and a provision for an overlay in a district wide matters chapter that cannot be resolved by carefully		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				district wide provisions also apply. That with respect to rules it is the more stringent rule that applies.	considering the wording of the provisions, it is the district wide overlay provision which prevails.		
FS67.32	The Shooting Box Limited		Support in part	The clarification sought by the submitter is agreed with, apart from the reference to where there is conflict then the district-wide provisions prevail. That is not the structure of the Plan which requires the more restrictive or more particular provision to apply where there is conflict between the provisions.			Accept
FS68.35	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part				Accept
FS69.34	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support in part				Accept
FS66.53	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part				Accept
FS570.1734	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS346.649	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S425.002	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Support in part	The overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed." The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically	Amend "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" as follows: "The overall activity status of a proposal will be determined on the basis of all rules which apply to the proposal. This includes rules in the District-Wide Matters and Area-Specific Matters. When a proposal involves several activities that are subject to multiple rules with different activity statuses, and/or involves an		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users because: The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences, for example, the Coastal Environment is silent with respect to farm quarries, defaulting to a permitted activity under How the Plan Works. Rule RPROZ-R12 Farm Quarry provides for this activity as a permitted activity.</p>	<p>activity/activities across multiple zones, precincts, areas, overlays or features, and it is appropriate to "bundle" the activities, the proposal will be assessed on the basis of the most restrictive activity status (unless otherwise stated). Where a rule for an overlay, zone or precinct controls an activity by reference to a proportion or percentage of the site, the control will be limited to that part of the site to which the overlay or zone applies. Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but there are no overlay rules that are applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone):... And amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.</p>	
S363.002	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works	Delete the following text from "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" (or to similar effect): ...Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but there are no overlay rules that are	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences. 	<p>applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). And amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.</p>	
<p>FS67.19</p>	<p>The Shooting Box Limited</p>		<p>Support in part</p>	<p>The outcome sought in the submission for greater clarity in the application of the overlays is generally supported, however that outcome may be achieved more efficiently and with less risk of unforeseen consequences by mostly retaining the District Plan text referred to in the submission and simply changing the reference to</p>	<p>Allow in part</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'permitted activity' to '..then reference need only be need to be made to the provisions in Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters' or similar.			
FS68.20	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part		Allow in part		Reject
FS69.19	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support in part		Allow in part		Reject
FS66.32	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part		Allow in part		Reject
FS111.008	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS111.012	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS369.032	Top Energy		Oppose		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.045	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Neutral		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of	Reject

Hearings Panel Recommendation – Recommendation Report 1

Appendix 3.1 Recommended Decisions on Submissions – Part 1 - Introduction and General Provisions

31/03/2026

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						the plan for plan users.	
S483.023	Top Energy Limited	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Not Stated	Top Energy considers that there is a lack of clarity throughout the PDP in terms of how the Chapters interact with each other, and some consistency. The How the Plan Works Chapter is key in terms of providing the necessary clarity for plan users.	Amend the 'Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions' section of the How the Plan Works Chapter to provide clarity in terms of how the chapters within the plan interact.		Accept in part
FS67.33	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	Amending to provide for better clarity is supported, as it is clear from submissions that there are several interpretations as to how the chapters interact.	Allow		Accept in part
FS67.34	The Shooting Box Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS68.36	P S Yates Family Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS69.35	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS66.54	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS78.032	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS351.006	A.W and D.M Simpson		Oppose		Disallow	Amend to protect environmental standards and values.	Reject
FS371.006	Oromahoe 18R2B2B2 Trust and its associated Hapu, Ngati Kawa,		Oppose		Disallow	Amend to protect environmental standards and values.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Te Ngare Hauata, Te Matarahurahu, Te Whanaurara, Ngati Kaihoro, Ngati Rahiri						
FS111.011	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS111.014	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS449.006	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Oppose		Disallow	Amend to protect environmental standards and values	Reject
FS403.046	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Accept in part
FS345.074	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S167.001	Bentzen Farm Limited	Applications Subject to	Support in part	As described in the National Planning	Insert a new clause within 'Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions', specifying that if an overlay is		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Multiple Provisions		<p>Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped.</p> <p>While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole.</p> <p>In many instances, overlays apply to part of but not the whole of the site. Applying the provisions to the site as a whole in these situations would not serve the resource management purpose of the overlay.</p> <p>In addition to the above, it is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the provisions relating to an activity.</p>	shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay		
FS143.1	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support		Allow		Reject
FS111.006	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)						
FS369.027	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.040	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
FS566.363	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S516.008	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific	Delete the following text from "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" (or to similar effect): ...Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but there are no overlay rules that are applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). And amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>	to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		
FS196.232	Joe Carr		Oppose	I am concerned that some apparently detached planner can make theoretical suggestions from afar that, if implemented would have a profound effect on those living in the Far North District	Disallow		Accept
FS111.009	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PH TTCCT)		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS111.013	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PH TTCCT)		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS369.033	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S168.001	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Support in part	<p>As described in the National Planning Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped. While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole. In many instances, overlays apply to part of but not the whole of the site. Applying the provisions to the site as a whole in these situations would not serve the resource management purpose of the overlay. In addition to the above, it is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the provisions relating to an activity.</p>	Insert a new clause within 'Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions', specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay		Reject
FS111.007	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle		Support in part	PHTTCCT agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)			should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.			
FS369.028	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.041	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
S344.003	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do	Delete the following text from "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" (or to similar effect): ...Some of the Overlay chapters only include rules for certain types of activities (e.g. natural character, natural features and landscapes or coastal environment). If your proposed activity is within one of these overlays, but there are no overlay rules that are applicable to your activity, then your activity can be treated as a permitted activity under the Overlay Chapter unless stated otherwise. Resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). And amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.			
FS111.0010	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS369.031	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.044	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
FS396.024	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S243.001	Matauri Trustee Limited	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Support in part	<p>As described in the National Planning Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped.</p> <p>While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole.</p> <p>In many instances, overlays apply to part of but not the whole of the site. Applying the provisions to the site as a whole in these situations would not serve the resource management purpose of the overlay.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the following part of the explanation is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the provisions relating to an activity</p>	Insert a new clause within 'Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions', specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay		Reject
FS534.027	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees that the unqualified application of the natural character	Allow	allow original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provisions to the margins of artificial waterbodies (i.e., water storages and farm dams that fall within the definition of "lakes") is likely to be problematic. An exception for artificial waterbodies is an appropriate method to avoid this situation from arising.			
FS369.030	Top Energy		Support in part		Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.043	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
FS570.559	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.573	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.595	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S187.001	The Shooting Box Limited	Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions	Support in part	As described in the National Planning Standard 2019, an overlay spatially identifies distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. It follows that the provisions relating to the overlay only apply to that part of a site so mapped. While this may be the intent of the overlays, in some instances in the Proposed Plan for overlay provisions, reference is made to 'the site'; the potential implication being that the overlay provisions apply to the site as a whole. In many instances, overlays apply to part of but not the whole of the site. Applying the provisions to the site as a whole in these situations would not serve the resource management purpose of the overlay. In addition to the above, it is necessary to specify that overlay chapters do not contain all the	Insert a new clause within 'Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions', specifying that if an overlay is shown on the Planning Maps, the overlay provisions only apply to the portion of the property covered by the overlay		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provisions relating to an activity.			
FS369.029	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy agrees that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.042	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
S359.003	Northland Regional Council	Cross boundary matters	Support in part	There are likely to be cross-boundary issues relating to jurisdictional boundaries with adjoining councils (e.g. incompatible/inconsistent provisions or zoning) that need to be considered. Earthworks, genetically modified organisms and vegetation clearance are likely candidates. Given the resource management reform we suggest looking at aligning the more generic district plan rules	Amend the plan to align the more generic district plan rules with those of adjoining councils		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with those of adjoining councils.			
FS570.1039	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS80.5	GE Free Northland		Support		Allow		Reject
FS572.004	GE Free Tai Tokerau		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.464	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1053	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1075	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S516.080	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Relationships between spatial layers	Not Stated	Ngā Tai Ora also acknowledge and support the zoning pattern surrounding Kerikeri recommending that this pattern should apply throughout the District, which utilises zoning buffers (Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle, or other zones that don't	Amend zone provisions to ensure adverse effects between zones at zone interface is managed by way of increased setbacks and/or noise and vibration considerations.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>provide for such intensive forms of residential development) between the Horticultural and Rural Production Zones and the General Residential Zone. This zoning pattern provides separation between the higher density residential activities and the more intensive land uses anticipated within the Rural Production and Horticultural zones which will in turn assist in minimising the extent of adverse effects on people's health and safety, and also minimising reverse sensitivity effects. Mineral Extraction Overlays also appear to be well separated from residential zoned land. The Kawakawa, Kaikohe, Omapere, Rawene, and Kaitaia settlements however don't appear to have the same level of protection.</p>		
S425.001	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Relationships between spatial layers	Support	PHTTCCT acknowledges the reference to 'Development Areas' in this section of the plan and supports planned growth as this helps ensure efficient and effective infrastructure, and connectivity. While it is acknowledged that there are no current growth	amend plan to ensure that there is clear integration between chapters, as well as overlays.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				strategies or structure plans, some are in development, and could be completed prior to the PDP being made Operative. To ensure that these strategic documents can be given effect to and implemented once approved by Council, provisions and assessment criteria that hold a space for these planning documents should be included.			
FS369.034	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy agrees that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS403.047	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora agree that the relationship between provisions and rules in zone/district wide chapters should be clarified to improve effectiveness of the plan for plan users.	Reject
S529.174	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	National policy statements and New	Not Stated	District councils manage the margins of water bodies and the activities that can occur in these	Amend the PDP to give full effect to the NPS - Freshwater Management 2020		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
		Zealand Coastal Policy Statement		<p>areas. Several parts of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) give national direction to district councils specifically.</p> <p>The NPS-FM contains objectives and policies to ensure that natural and physical resources are managed in a way that prioritises the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, the health needs of people (such as drinking water) and the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future.</p> <p>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</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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. Recent government guidance on the NPS-FM14 (p.8) notes that district plans must be reviewed/amended to give effect to the NPS-FM, including the following aspects: 'District plans must be reviewed and, if necessary, amended to give effect to the NPS-FM "as soon as reasonably practicable". 'The NPS-FM applies to all freshwater, and Te Mana o te Wai is relevant to all resource management where it affects freshwater, including in city and district planning. 'Clause 3.5 Integrated management requires a ki uta ki tai (integrated approach) to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai. It also sets out requirements relevant to city and district councils. This includes</p>		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				encouraging the coordination and sequencing of urban growth, and promoting positive effects and managing adverse effects of urban development on freshwater bodies. 'To give effect to Te Mana o te Wai, councils must consider matters such as how urban growth and increases in impervious surfaces will impact on stormwater flows, how stormwater affects the water bodies it is discharged to, and methods to manage urban growth and stormwater discharge. The identification and control of urban growth areas must prioritise the health and well-being of water bodies.'			
FS66.83	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission lacks specificity of outcome in its relief.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2062	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2076	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2098	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S442.012	Kapiro Conservation Trust	National policy statements	Support in part	The implementation of the NPS-FM and managing freshwater to give effect to	Amend PDP to give effect to the NPS FM's fundamental concept of Te Mana o te Wai (including the principles and the hierarchy of obligations) should		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
		and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement		<p>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 -</p> <p>'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))'</p>	<p>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)).</p>		
FS66.86	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission lacks specificity in its relief sought.	Disallow		Accept
FS243.099	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose		Disallow in part	Amend TSL-P3 to include more specific recognition of the importance of	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						protecting and enhancing natural values, including protection of SNAs	
FS404.073	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1708	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.623	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1735	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S527.035	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Not Stated	We consider that the new PDP should address the NPS Freshwater Management, it needs to be given effect in all relevant parts of the DP, including the Ecosystems & Biodiversity chapter and Natural Character chapter.	Amend the PDP where necessary to give effect to the NPS Freshwater Management		Reject
FS277.44	Jenny Collison		Support	Fresh water should be protected	Allow		Reject
FS566.1897	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S442.011	Kapiro Conservation Trust	National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Support in part	RMA s74((1) states that: 'A territorial authority must prepare and change its district plan in accordance with ... a national policy statement'. District councils manage the margins of water	Amend PDP to give effect to the NPS Freshwater Management 2020 in all relevant parts of the DP, including the Ecosystems and Biodiversity, and Natural Character Chapters.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				bodies and the activities that can occur in these areas. Several parts of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) give national direction to district councils specifically.			
FS404.072	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	Reject
FS570.1707	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.622	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1734	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S442.013	Kapiro Conservation Trust	National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	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) 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	Amend PDP 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 (NPS-FM s1.3(2))		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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))'			
FS404.074	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	Reject
FS570.1709	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.624	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1736	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S442.014	Kapiro Conservation Trust	National policy statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	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) specifically requires that	Amend the PDP to avoid 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.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 -</p> <p>'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))'</p>			
FS404.075	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	Reject
FS570.1710	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.625	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1737	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S138.022	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	Rules	Support in part	To further improve housing choices for low-moderate income households in the Far North and in addition to the amendments sought in the submission, seek that the Council consider including a separate Inclusionary Housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated CHP to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments. The appropriate % share of lots would need to be determined for the Far North District, as it would essentially be a financial contribution condition for which a district plan policy is required under Section 108 (10).	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated community housing provider to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments.		Reject
FS243.083	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora endorses the need to address affordability within the Far North District. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The Queenstown Lakes District	Disallow	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter or integrate	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>Council Inclusionary Housing Plan Change remains incomplete and submissions on the plan change are yet to be heard. There have been no hearings on the plan change, and therefore the approach proposed by the Council is not confirmed. Majority of the submissions made on the QLDC Plan Change opposes the approach taken by the Council and several of those submissions are questioning the legality of the provisions within the RMA framework.</p>		
<p>S138.023</p>	<p>Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd</p>	<p>Rules</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>To further improve housing choices for low-moderate income households in the Far North and in addition to the amendments sought in the submission, seek that the Council consider including a separate Inclusionary Housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated CHP to ensure</p>	<p>Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated community housing provider to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments.</p>	<p>Reject</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments. The appropriate % share of lots would need to be determined for the Far North District, as it would essentially be a financial contribution condition for which a district plan policy is required under Section 108 (10).			
FS243.183	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora endorses the need to address affordability within the Far North District. However, Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. The Queenstown Lakes District Council Inclusionary Housing Plan Change remains incomplete and submissions on the plan change are yet to be heard. There have been no hearings on the plan change, and therefore the approach proposed by the Council is not confirmed. Majority of the submissions made on the QLDC Plan Change opposes the approach taken by the Council and several of those submissions are questioning the legality of the provisions within the RMA framework	Disallow	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter or integrate	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S436.007	Northland Fish and Game Council	GRZ-R3	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>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 any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular</p>	<p>Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.			
FS570.1471	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.093	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1485	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1507	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.011	Northland Fish and Game Council	GRZ-R9	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
FS570.1475	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.097	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1489	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1511	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.010	Northland Fish and Game Council	RPROZ-R3	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.	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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 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.			
FS570.1474	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.096	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1488	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1510	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.012	Northland Fish and Game Council	RLZ-R3	Not Stated	<p>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</p>	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy 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.			
FS570.1476	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.098	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1490	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1512	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.013	Northland Fish and Game Council	RRZ-R3	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,	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
FS570.1477	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						submission is inconsistent with our original submission	
FS346.099	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1491	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1513	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.014	Northland Fish and Game Council	RSZ-R3	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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 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.			
FS570.1478	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.100	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1492	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
FS569.1514	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S138.024	Kairos Connection Trust and Habitat for Humanity Northern Region Ltd	Rules	Support in part	To further improve housing choices for low-moderate income households in the Far North and in addition to the amendments sought in the submission, seek that the Council consider including a separate Inclusionary Housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated CHP to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments. The appropriate % share of lots would need to be determined for the Far North District, as it would essentially be a financial contribution condition for which a district plan policy	Insert a separate Inclusionary housing chapter, or integrate throughout proposed subdivision and residential and mixed use zone chapters, provision for inclusionary housing that would require a 5% share of the estimated value of the sale of subdivided lots (or as appropriate to the Far North context) to a nominated community housing provider to ensure the establishment of affordable housing within its high growth urban environments.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				is required under Section 108 (10).		
S436.015	Northland Fish and Game Council	MUZ-R4	Not Stated	<p>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 any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise</p>	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
FS570.1479	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1493	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1515	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.009	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rules	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.	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
FS345.027	Ngawha Generation Limited		Oppose	NGL opposes the relief sought as it is vague, unjustified and will be impossible to implement.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1473	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.095	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1487	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1509	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.008	Northland Fish and Game Council	Rules	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
FS570.1472	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.094	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1486	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1508	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.016	Northland Fish and Game Council	NOSZ-R16	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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 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.			
FS570.1480	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.102	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1494	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1516	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S436.017	Northland Fish and Game Council	OSZ-R15	Not Stated	<p>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 any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places</p>	<p>Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.</p>	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimai used during the game bird hunting season.			
FS570.1481	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1495	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1517	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.018	Northland Fish and Game Council	SARZ-R16	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p>			
FS570.1482	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.104	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.						
FS566.1496	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1518	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.019	Northland Fish and Game Council	CAR-R3	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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 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.			
FS570.1483	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.105	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1497	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1519	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
S436.020	Northland Fish and Game Council	HZ-R3	Not Stated	<p>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 any other person is guilty of an offence. Shotgun noise</p>	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
FS570.1484	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.106	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1498	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1520	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.021	Northland Fish and Game Council	KCZ-R3	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.	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
FS534.054	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	There are no publicly accessible recreational hunting areas in the Kauri Cliffs Zone. The zone is held in single ownership	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>and hunting is not permitted by the owners. The presence of any recreational hunting opportunities on land adjacent to the Kauri Cliffs Zone, is not a resource management reason to place additional land use and development controls on the Kauri Cliffs Zone (or any other zone). The submission is seeking to protect hunting opportunities from reverse sensitivity effects arising from housing development, regardless of the underlying zoning of the land. This is not an appropriate resource management approach, given the relative contribution of housing development to achieving the purpose of the Act. The submission also refers to 'industrial' developments. There are no industrial activities present in the Kauri Cliffs Zone and rule KCZ-R11 would apply a discretionary consenting pathway to any industrial development.</p>			
FS570.1485	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
FS346.107	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1499	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1521	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.022	Northland Fish and Game Council	KRT-R3	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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.</p>			
<p>FS570.1486</p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 3</p>		<p>Oppose</p>		<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Accept</p>
<p>FS346.108</p>	<p>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.</p>		<p>Support</p>		<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow the original submission</p>	<p>Reject</p>
<p>FS566.1500</p>	<p>Kapiro Conservation Trust 2</p>		<p>Oppose</p>		<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with</p>	<p>Accept</p>

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						our original submission	
FS569.1522	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.023	Northland Fish and Game Council	MPZ-R4	Not Stated	<p>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</p>	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy 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.			
FS570.1487	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.109	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1501	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1523	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.024	Northland Fish and Game Council	MIZ-R2	Not Stated	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>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 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</p>	<p>values.</p>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				game bird hunting season.			
FS570.1488	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.110	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1502	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1524	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S436.025	Northland Fish and Game Council	QR-R3	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	Insert provisions that constrain housing and industrial developments near areas with recreational hunting values.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				<p>discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration.</p> <p>Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season.</p> <p>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 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.</p>			
FS570.1489	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.111	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.						
FS566.1503	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1525	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S524.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Process	Support	Support planned growth as this helps ensure efficient and effective infrastructure, and connectivity. While it is acknowledged that there are no current growth strategies or structure plans, some are in development, and could be completed prior to the PDP being made Operative. To ensure that these strategic documents can be given effect and implemented once approved by Council, provisions and assessment criteria that hold a space for these planning documents should be included.	Continue to develop spatial and strategic direction for the District's urban centres and include place holding provisions throughout the plan		Reject
FS25.0010	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	The FNDP should give effect to and implement strategic documents	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				addressing planned growth for reasons including that adequate infrastructure must be in place to support development.			
FS325.008	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS277.9	Jenny Collison		Support		Allow		Reject
FS566.1819	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.066	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Process	Support	Support planned growth as this helps ensure efficient and effective infrastructure, and connectivity. While it is acknowledged that there are no current growth strategies or structure plans, some are in development, and could be completed prior to the PDP being made Operative. To ensure that these strategic documents can be given effect and implemented once approved by Council, provisions and assessment criteria that hold a space for these planning documents should be included.		Continue to develop spatial and strategic direction for the District's urban centres and include place holding provisions throughout the plan.	Reject
FS25.012	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	The FNDP should give effect to and implement strategic documents	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				addressing planned growth.			
FS403.003	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Seek provision details as above.	Reject
FS570.1954	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1968	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1990	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S271.001	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Process	Support	Support planned growth as this helps ensure efficient and effective infrastructure, and connectivity. While it is acknowledged that there are no current growth strategies or structure plans, some are in development, and could be completed prior to the PDP being made Operative. To ensure that these strategic documents can be given effect and implemented once approved by Council, provisions and assessment criteria that hold a space for these planning documents should be included.	Continue to develop spatial and strategic direction for the District's urban centres and include place holding provisions throughout the plan.		Reject
FS25.045	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	The FNDP should give effect to and implement strategic documents	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				addressing planned growth.			
FS36.001	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS325.025	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS277.1	Jenny Collison		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.724	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.738	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.760	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S338.008	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Approach to Integrated Management	Not Stated	Spatial planning is an essential tool for achieving good planning outcomes. While we are encouraged to see that integrated development is identified as a strategic direction of the PDP, it is difficult to see how this will be implemented without having the relevant local plans to provide such direction, such as spatial plans, community plans or masterplans. We consider the lack of such documents to be a missed opportunity to rectify the historic pattern of ad-hoc development done in isolation resulting in poor planning outcomes.	Amend the PDP to incorporate a space holder through all relevant provisions in the plan to enable Council to continue to develop spatial plans, masterplans etc, and provide PDP mechanisms to implement such plans promptly, including through the review process should the plans be completed prior to the Proposed Plan being made Operative.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS25.003	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Implementation of urban design principles is a cornerstone to achieving well-functioning urban environments.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS325.003	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS403.039	Te Whatu Ora - Nga Tai Ora		Support in part		Allow in part	Te Whatu Ora supports the establishment of a centres hierarchy with identification of growth aspirations to establish consolidated, vibrant urban environments.	Reject
FS570.949	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.963	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.985	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S446.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Directions Overview	Support	Support planned growth as this helps ensure efficient and effective infrastructure, and connectivity. While it is acknowledged that there are no current growth strategies or structure plans, some are in development, and could	Amend to Continue to develop spatial and strategic direction for the District's urban centres in particular, and include place holding provisions throughout the plan.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Council Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be completed prior to the PDP being made Operative. To ensure that these strategic documents can be given effect and implemented once approved by Council, provisions and assessment criteria that hold a space for these planning documents should be included.			
FS111.061	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail but support amendments to ensure it will truly enable the maintenance, upgrade and extension of the Trail and alignment with the direction of the RPS.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Reject
FS111.136	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support the enablement of works within the Twin Coast Trail but support amendments to ensure it will truly enable the maintenance, upgrade and extension of the Trail and alignment with the direction of the RPS.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1781	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1759	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow		Reject