

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S11.002	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust (the Trust) has recently purchased Elliot Bay Farm in Far North District. The Trust is generally supportive of the Far North Proposed District Plan as it affects the land it administers and notes the work of the Trust will significantly assist Council to achieve objectives in the proposed plan such as improving public access to coastal area and protecting natural character. The Trust is however concerned that some provisions of the coastal and natural character overlays may make its work expensive and difficult. The Trust is seeking clarification or amendment of these overlay provisions to allow it to upgrade and existing public camping area, construct walking tracks and undertake restoration work.	Amend the provisions (by way of specific controls) or at least clarification to allow the following activities to be undertaken within the land at Elliot Bay Farm (most of the farm encompassed at 1077A and 1076 Rawhiti Road, Russell or certificate of titles NA40A/1111 and NA1111/297), which is currently zoned Rural Production, with Coastal and Outstanding Natural Landscape overlays: - Formation of a high quality all weather walking track that includes a section from Whangamumu Harbour to Ngaiotonga Scenic Reserve. This track (maximum width 2metres) will go above Elliot Bay (outside the Coastal hazard areas) then head inland alongside Rawhiti Road before heading inland up Wairoa Stream. (Note: maps showing possible walking tracks are attached to original submission) - Maintain and upgrade the existing summer camping ground at Elliot Bay with associated car parking, walking tracks and facilities NB buildings associated with this camping ground will be toilets and structures to provide water, refuse disposal etc (new built accommodation is not planned at this site). - The potential for DOC type huts near Whangamumu and in the Wairoa Stream catchment to cater for walkers on the multi-day walk. - Directional and interpretive signs. - Restoration and amenity plantings of native species with associated fencing to exclude stock.	Accept in part
S151.003	NFS Farms Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	The High Natural character overlay (inferred: coastal environment overlay) is proposed to apply along the coastal margins and in the gullies close to the coast on the submitters land at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469)). This overlay and associated provisions acknowledge the significant ecological and landscape qualities of the land and the potential to protect and enhance natural freshwater assets and indigenous vegetation.	Retain coastal environment provisions as notified.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S551.005	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated		Provide further information including methodology, technical reports and s32 evaluation evidence to support the ONC and HNC mapping in the PDP, specifically the mapping in relation to "ONC44" which does not extend onto the foreshore despite the RPS mapping showing more extensive ONC overlay on Puwheke Beach. Lucklaw Farm reserves the right to provide further comment upon receipt of this further information.		Reject
S359.039	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	There are potential effects associated with carbon farming such as lack of fire breaks, closer planting spaces and resulting difficulty in pest management as well as those normally associated with production forestry such as amenity and visual effects, wilding pine and fire risk.	Amend the Plan to consider including controls on exotic carbon forestry within the coastal environment, natural character areas, ONFL and areas of elite soils to protect the values of these resources and to manage nuisance such as shading, plant pest spread and fire risk.		Accept in part
FS176.1	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	The adverse effects being attributed to carbon forestry are equally attributable to other land uses that would not be subject to control.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS108.5	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.17	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	Specific controls on exotic carbon farming are needed to address better the risks, including fire, pests and wilding spread.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1075	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.500	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1089	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1111	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.180	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Federated Farmers has identified that both coastal environment and coastal hazard layers have captured areas of rural farmland. It is important that the Council provides for everyday agricultural activities to occur in the coastal environment, many of which already do. The amount of land captured is small and would allow the Council to engage individually with each landowner to provide necessary education and information on the particular challenges and restrictions placed on their land. Federated Farmers seeks that the areas of high natural character are deleted from this section as the coastal environment, outstanding natural character and indigenous biodiversity rules are consistent with section 6(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 in protecting these areas from inappropriate subdivision and development. Without the high natural character layer, the District Plan still meets the Council's obligations under the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement as well as the Northland Regional Policy Statement	Delete all references to high character areas from the Coastal Environment chapter		Reject
FS155.24	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
FS196.142	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS165.8	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	421.180-183 and 185 and 186. As per concerns in original submission.	Allow in part		Reject
FS272.9	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich		Support in part	421.180-183 and 185 and 186. As per concerns in original submission.	Allow in part		Reject
FS372.011	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	It is appropriate and consistent with the relevant provisions in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement to include provisions relating to high natural character areas in the proposed District Plan.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS354.008	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that all references to high character areas are deleted from the Coastal Environment chapter as they are not necessary to meet the requirements of the RMA, NPSCS or RPS but include large areas of rural land which affects	Allow	Allow S421.180 to delete all references to high character areas from the Coastal Environment chapter	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the ability to use it for rural production purposes. HortNZ supports this approach.			
FS332.232	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS404.008	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The relief is inconsistent with section 6(a) of the Act and the relevant National Policy Statements.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.1412	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.414	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1426	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1448	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S425.011	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	PHTTCCT acknowledges the sensitivities of the Coastal Environment and supports the provision for the functional and operation need for regionally significant infrastructure but seeks amendments to make sure that minor upgrades are adequately provided for to enable the efficient and cost effective operation and maintenance of The Trail.	amend CE to provide for maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is appropriately provide for.		Accept in part
FS36.011	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Support recognition of the functional and operational need for regionally significant infrastructure to be located in the Coastal Environment as appropriate.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S338.037	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We support policies/rules that seek to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas. Sprawling development and residential growth in rural areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area	Retain Policy CE-P4 and include similar provisions/rules in other zones/chapters		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas. We support Coastal environment policy CE-P4 which states 'avoiding sprawl or sporadic patterns of development'. However, the PDP should add similar provisions/rules in other zones/chapters			
FS550.028	Lloyd Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS333.013	Maree Hart		Support	The submitter supports relief sought to prevent fragmentation or loss of productive land, to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural areas and protect amenity values. Residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons. It would be contrary to the NPS-UD in enabling urban sprawl and not protecting rural land. Government reports have found that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided as it leads to permanent loss of productive capability. Residential development on Lot 1001 would also create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities in the area. Lot 1001 is one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil in the district which is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential providing food, local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC submission to MPI recognised that large areas of horticultural land in Kerikeri have been converted to residential and therefore it is vital to protect the remaining rural land that is highly productive.	Allow	Amend zoning of Lot 1001 DP 532487 to Horticulture zone or Rural Production zone; Amend Rural Production, Horticulture and Rural Lifestyle zone provisions to prevent urban sprawl, and protect productive soil, rural character and amenity values; Amend the District Plan to strengthen provisions for assessing and preventing cumulative and long-term adverse effects on productive areas, rural areas, areas visible from public land, ecological values and freshwater.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. There are alternative sites in the area which could provide a compact urban footprint and improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Lot 1001 is also adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline which is a valuable economic asset for the area. Residential development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects. The surrounding rural environment lacks the appropriate infrastructure, school capacity and existing safety and traffic issues on Landing Road such as a one lane bridge. There would also be effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS277.38	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Our Kerikeri submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.975	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.989	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1011	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS549.028	Vanessa Anderson		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS443.028	Peter O'Neil Donnellon		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS390.028	Tracey Schubert		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS353.028	Al Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS352.028	Kathryn Panckhurst		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons -	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS342.028	Chris Baker		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS338.028	Pearl Mahoney		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS337.028	Kevin Mahoney		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS336.028	Roger Holman		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network)that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi& ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS335.028	Craig and Mary Sawers		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land).	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi & ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
FS334.028	Fiona Clarke		Support	It is clear that urban/residential development at Lot 1001 DP 532487 (productive farmland) and the surrounding rural area would be inappropriate for many reasons - National Policy Standards recognise the need for district plans to support a well-functioning urban environment in towns such as Kerikeri and achieve a compact urban footprint that is accessible by active transport (i.e. walking, cycling), and protect productive rural land from inappropriate urban/residential sprawl. Lot 1001 has a large area of good quality soil. It	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				has one of the few remaining large blocks of Class 2 soil/land in the District. This is a strictly finite resource. Keeping good land for agricultural production is essential for feeding ourselves and a growing world population in future decades, and necessary for local jobs and economic well-being. FNDC has recognised that: "Kerikeri has converted large areas of horticulture land into residential and rural lifestyle activities over the last 20 years. Therefore it is vital to protect this remaining finite resource and other rural land that is highly productive" (FNDC (2019) submission to MPI on productive land). Government reports and studies have concluded that the creation of lifestyle blocks and residential development on productive land should be avoided because it fragments rural areas and leads to the permanent loss of productive capability. Lot 1001 adjoins the Horticulture zone on its west and southwest boundaries, so it is logical to include it in the Horticulture zone. Alternatively, Rural Production zoning would also protect the essential natural resource at this site. Lot 1001 lies adjacent to a large irrigation pipeline (underground network) that serves productive land on Kapiro Road; this irrigation infrastructure is a valuable economic asset for the area. In legal terms, there is no 'functional need' to build residential development on this particular site. There are alternative sites more appropriate for residential development. e.g. S522.004 Vision Kerikeri noted a large alternative site next to SH10 Sports Hub that would provide a compact urban footprint and would actually improve connectivity with central Kerikeri. Residential development of Lot 1001 farmland would create reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established activities and neighbouring producers. Residential/urban development in the traffic catchment north of Landing Road will generate cumulative adverse effects - including urban sprawl in a rural environment that lacks appropriate infrastructure; school at capacity; large volumes of traffic, one-lane bridge and safety issues in Landing Road; effects on at-risk native species, kiwi&			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ecological values, water quality, landscape, rural character and amenity values.			
S150.001	Robert Adams	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Supports the coastal environment overlay in principal but the provisions create some distortions and issues that need to be resolved. For example: - The height limit for the Russell township zone is 7.2 m and the height limit for coastal overlay is 5 m. Applying a coastal height of 5 m to a urban area makes no sense. Equally applying it to long beach rear sites in the Rural Lifestyle zone makes no sense when most of the houses built under the cliff are already up to 8 m high. - the ability to carry out extensions under Per 2 and Per 3. Why restrict extensions in what are urban areas like Russell and Long beach houses on rear lots. - colours and materials required by a coastal overlay create problems in urban areas and Long beach houses in the Rural lifestyle because the majority of the sites have already been developed. Those not developed will need to comply and additions and extensions will need to comply. These provisions will require unnecessary resource consents with associated time and costs, for normal urban activities which are normally permitted.	Amend the coastal environment overlay provisions so that the provisions do not apply to urban areas and houses on rear lots at Long Beach in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.		Accept in part
FS407.004	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported on the basis that the Coastal Environment provisions for urban areas creates unnecessary tensions in terms of height limits. 5m height limits in urban	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS400.005	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Coastal Environment provisions for urban areas creates unnecessary tensions in terms of height limits. 5m height limits in urban areas are not considered appropriate.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS396.005	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Coastal Environment provisions for urban areas creates unnecessary tensions in terms of height limits. 5m height limits in urban areas are not considered appropriate	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS586.001	Peter Malcom	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Support the removal of the Coastal Environment Overlay provisions from Rural Lifestyle Zones in Russell and around Kerikeri	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S431.026	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Retain the Coastal Environment chapter subject to amendments as sought in submission		Accept in part
FS332.026	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S436.006	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m ²) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Insert provisions that provide for the building of maimai on wetlands or near a lake or river as a permitted activity.		Accept in part
FS570.1470	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.092	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1484	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1506	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S483.170	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In terms of 'How the Plan Works, it is unclear how this Chapter interacts with other District Wide Chapters. Based on the exclusion of a catch all discretionary activity status for rules not otherwise specified, it appears that for any activity not specified, the default activity status is permitted. As noted in the earlier submission points, this should be clarified in the Chapter itself. Top Energy seeks a permitted activity default where not otherwise specified in clarified through notes and/or rule; and That it be clarified that this includes activities managed District Wide Chapter (e.g., Infrastructure and Renewable Electricity Generation). that for activities default to permitted activity unless otherwise specified, and that this includes.	Amend to provide clarity around interrelationship between chapters.		Reject
FS345.221	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
S483.171	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In terms of 'How the Plan Works, it is unclear how this Chapter interacts with other District Wide Chapters. Based on the exclusion of a catch all discretionary activity status for rules not otherwise specified, it appears that for any activity not specified, the default activity status is permitted. As noted in the earlier submission points, this should be clarified in the Chapter itself. Top Energy seeks a permitted activity default where not otherwise specified in clarified through notes and/or rule; and That it be clarified that this includes activities managed District Wide Chapter (e.g., Infrastructure and Renewable Electricity Generation). that for activities default to permitted activity unless otherwise specified, and that this includes.	Amend to confirm permitted activity status for activities not otherwise specified including where the activities are managed by District Wide Chapter (e.g. Infrastructure and Renewable Electricity Generation).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS345.222	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
S522.028	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	District Plan Framework	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.		Reject
FS24.67	Lynley Newport		Oppose	The PDP coastal environment overlay, as I understand it, reflects the coastal environment as defined in the RPS higher order document. To alter them would mean being inconsistent with that higher order document, which a PDP cannot be.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.28	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.72	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.31	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.30	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.49	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS566.1767	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS180.2	Kim Taylor		Support	THE EXISTING SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE ("SKIZ") SHOULD BE REINSTATED IN THE	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PROPOSED NEW PLAN WITH ALL CONSEQUENT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN COMMENTARY THE OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN CONTAINS(MY EMPHASIS IN RED):- “10.10 SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE CONTEXT The South Kerikeri Inlet Zone is located along the southern edge of the Kerikeri Inlet and as such forms a part of the maritime gateway to the historic settlement of Kerikeri. Whilst predominantly rolling pastoral country, the landform also includes low-lying backshore flats, coastal flanks and areas of very steep and unstable terrain. While much of the coastal margin of the inner Kerikeri inlet has been urbanised, the coastal margins of this area retain their natural qualities being relatively free of built structures. The open spaces and rural nature of the area provide visual relief from the other more modified areas of the coast. Its visual importance is increased given its proximity to the more urbanised area of adjacent Kerikeri Township. It is an area of “contrast” between the more urbanised areas to the west and the lower lying area to the east. The Okura River to the west and the Waitangi Wetland to the east form natural boundaries that set this area apart. Because of its undulating nature, the entire area is not visible from any one location. The more elevated portions of the land which are visible from a wide area and those slopes facing the Inlet are particularly sensitive. Other areas are more introspective and contained. The natural character, open space and rural nature of the area are important to the visual context of the wider area. 10.10.1 ISSUES These issues supplement those set out in Section 10.1.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				10.10.1.1 The natural, open, rural and coastal character of the South Kerikeri Inlet Zone can come under pressure by development that is not sympathetic to that character. 10.10.1.2 Because of the generally smaller lot sizes, rural residential development in the coastal environment can have adverse visual effects and consequently can affect the amenity of the area for adjoining land owners and the public." The existing "SKIZ" was the result of thousands of hours of consideration and consultation including the local landowners, expert planners, environmental consultants , landscape consultants . Department of Conservation , Forest and Bird, planning lawyers , environment court judges, several hearings and finally an appeal before the Environment Court . It was agreed by all contributing parties, including the FNDC . There can have been few, if any areas, given as much time, professional and expert effort and consideration before the final inclusion of SKIZ in its current form in the operative district plan. As such it should be the "go to "provision for this area for the future proposed plan . If a change is proposed it should first undergo a similar intensive process and give very clear cogent resource management reasons, why it should be reviewed. None of this appears to have happened . The Resource Management Act has not substantially changed , the topography and location that "set this area apart" as described above has not (cannot) materially change and yet substantial changes are now proposed which , inter alia, double the residential intensity and now ignore the recognition of "sensitive areas " within SKIZ as shown in the operative plan. It can never be argued that there is a shortage of development/rural lifestyle land in the FNDC.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There appears to be no valid resource management justification for this proposed change. Do we really have to go through the same extensive process as last time to reach what, (given that the SKIZ was formulated from the best expert advice and agreed by the FNDC), can only be materially the same as last time.			
S338.042	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	District Plan Framework	Not Stated	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.		Reject
FS67.29	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.68	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.32	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.31	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.50	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.980	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.994	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1016	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS180.3	Kim Taylor		Support	THE EXISTING SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE ("SKIZ") SHOULD BE REINSTATED IN THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN WITH ALL CONSEQUENT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN COMMENTARY THE OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN CONTAINS(MY EMPHASIS IN RED):- "10.10 SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE CONTEXT The South Kerikeri Inlet Zone is located along the southern edge of the Kerikeri Inlet and as such forms a part of the maritime gateway to the historic settlement of Kerikeri. Whilst predominantly rolling pastoral country, the landform also includes low-lying backshore flats, coastal flanks and areas of very steep and unstable terrain. While much of the coastal margin of the inner Kerikeri inlet has been urbanised, the coastal margins of this area retain their natural qualities being relatively free of built structures. The open spaces and rural nature of the area provide visual relief from the other more modified areas of the coast. Its visual importance is increased given its proximity to the more urbanised area of adjacent Kerikeri Township. It is an area of "contrast" between the more urbanised areas to the west and the lower lying area to the east. The Okura River to the west and the Waitangi Wetland to the east form natural boundaries that set this area apart. Because of its undulating nature, the entire area is not visible from any one location. The more elevated portions of the land which are visible from a wide area and those slopes facing the Inlet are particularly sensitive. Other areas are more introspective and contained. The natural character, open space and rural nature of the area are important to the visual context of the wider area.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				10.10.1 ISSUES These issues supplement those set out in Section 10.1. 10.10.1.1 The natural, open, rural and coastal character of the South Kerikeri Inlet Zone can come under pressure by development that is not sympathetic to that character. 10.10.1.2 Because of the generally smaller lot sizes, rural residential development in the coastal environment can have adverse visual effects and consequently can affect the amenity of the area for adjoining land owners and the public.” The existing “SKIZ” was the result of thousands of hours of consideration and consultation including the local landowners, expert planners, environmental consultants , landscape consultants . Department of Conservation , Forest and Bird, planning lawyers , environment court judges, several hearings and finally an appeal before the Environment Court . It was agreed by all contributing parties, including the FNDC . There can have been few, if any areas, given as much time, professional and expert effort and consideration before the final inclusion of SKIZ in its current form in the operative district plan. As such it should be the “go to “provision for this area for the future proposed plan . If a change is proposed it should first undergo a similar intensive process and give very clear cogent resource management reasons, why it should be reviewed. None of this appears to have happened . The Resource Management Act has not substantially changed , the topography and location that “set this area apart” as described above has not (cannot) materially change and yet substantial changes are now proposed which , inter alia, double the residential intensity and now ignore the recognition of “sensitive areas “ within SKIZ as shown in the operative plan.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				It can never be argued that there is a shortage of development/rural lifestyle land in the FNDC. There appears to be no valid resource management justification for this proposed change. Do we really have to go through the same extensive process as last time to reach what, (given that the SKIZ was formulated from the best expert advice and agreed by the FNDC), can only be materially the same as last time.			
S529.041	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	District Plan Framework	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.		Reject
FS67.30	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.44	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.33	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.32	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.51	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to redefine the extent of the coastal environment does not give effect to the NZCPS or the Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.1931	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1945	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1967	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS180.4	Kim Taylor		Support	THE EXISTING SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE ("SKIZ") SHOULD BE REINSTATED IN THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN WITH ALL CONSEQUENT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN COMMENTARY THE OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN CONTAINS(MY EMPHASIS IN RED):- "10.10 SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE CONTEXT The South Kerikeri Inlet Zone is located along the southern edge of the Kerikeri Inlet and as such forms a part of the maritime gateway to the historic settlement of Kerikeri. Whilst predominantly rolling pastoral country, the landform also includes low-lying backshore flats, coastal flanks and areas of very steep and unstable terrain. While much of the coastal margin of the inner Kerikeri inlet has been urbanised, the coastal margins of this area retain their natural qualities being relatively free of built structures. The open spaces and rural nature of the area provide visual relief from the other more modified areas of the coast. Its visual importance is increased given its proximity to the more urbanised area of adjacent Kerikeri Township. It is an area of "contrast" between the more urbanised areas to the west and the lower lying area to the east. The Okura River to the west and the Waitangi Wetland to the east form natural boundaries that set this area apart. Because of its undulating nature, the entire area is not visible from any one location. The more elevated portions of the land which are visible from a wide area and those slopes facing the Inlet are particularly sensitive. Other areas are more introspective and contained. The natural character,	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				open space and rural nature of the area are important to the visual context of the wider area. 10.10.1 ISSUES These issues supplement those set out in Section 10.1. 10.10.1.1 The natural, open, rural and coastal character of the South Kerikeri Inlet Zone can come under pressure by development that is not sympathetic to that character. 10.10.1.2 Because of the generally smaller lot sizes, rural residential development in the coastal environment can have adverse visual effects and consequently can affect the amenity of the area for adjoining land owners and the public." The existing "SKIZ" was the result of thousands of hours of consideration and consultation including the local landowners, expert planners, environmental consultants , landscape consultants . Department of Conservation , Forest and Bird, planning lawyers , environment court judges, several hearings and finally an appeal before the Environment Court . It was agreed by all contributing parties, including the FNDC . There can have been few, if any areas, given as much time, professional and expert effort and consideration before the final inclusion of SKIZ in its current form in the operative district plan. As such it should be the "go to "provision for this area for the future proposed plan . If a change is proposed it should first undergo a similar intensive process and give very clear cogent resource management reasons, why it should be reviewed. None of this appears to have happened . The Resource Management Act has not substantially changed , the topography and location that "set this area apart" as described above has not (cannot) materially change and yet substantial changes are now proposed which , inter alia, double the residential intensity and now ignore the recognition			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of "sensitive areas " within SKIZ as shown in the operative plan. It can never be argued that there is a shortage of development/rural lifestyle land in the FNDC. There appears to be no valid resource management justification for this proposed change. Do we really have to go through the same extensive process as last time to reach what, (given that the SKIZ was formulated from the best expert advice and agreed by the FNDC), can only be materially the same as last time.			
S451.017	Pacific Eco-Logic	District Plan Framework	Not Stated	There are no non-regulatory methods	1. Include a non-regulatory methods section which should include: 1. A commitment to monitor and report on changes in natural character, at least in areas of development. Councils' failure to do so was a major criticism in the Review of the first NZCPS by Dr Jo Rosier in 2003. 2. Incentives to encourage long-term protection and restoration of coastal natural character 3. Priorities for natural character restoration in the coastal environment		Reject
FS332.204	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.1522	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1536	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1558	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.161	Kapiro Conservation Trust	District Plan Framework	Not Stated	There are no non-regulatory methods.	1. Include a non-regulatory methods section which should include: 1. A commitment to monitor and report on changes in natural character, at least in areas of development. Councils' failure to do so was a major criticism in the Review of the first NZCPS by Dr Jo Rosier in 2003. 2. Incentives to encourage long-term protection and restoration of coastal natural character 3. Priorities for natural character restoration in the coastal environment		Reject
FS346.772	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
S511.002	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	COASTAL ENVIRONMENT	Neutral		Retain definition		Accept
FS164.002	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS570.1573	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1587	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1609	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S442.022	Kapiro Conservation Trust	COASTAL ENVIRONMENT	Neutral	No reason stated.	Retain definition.		Accept
FS570.1718	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS346.633	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.1745	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept
S386.029	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	New Definition	Oppose	Ridgeline, headland and peninsula are not defined terms and are somewhat subjective terms to include within rule criteria for the purpose of determining whether consent is required or not. It is also unclear as to whether the rule is intending to protect the skyline within the CE or act as a generic visual amenity consent trigger. If the former, we consider the rule could be reworded to make reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland or peninsula".	Insert definitions of ridgeline, headland and peninsula.		Accept in part.
S29.009	Bayswater Inn Ltd	Rules	Oppose	Coastal Environment Overlay - With regard to the inclusion of 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, in the coastal environment overlay, the PDP has introduced new rules which have an impact on the subdivision status, along with the future development of the sites. The creation of lots in the coastal environment would in terms of subdivision be assessed as a Discretionary Activity, whereas it is currently a Controlled Activity. Some of the restrictions on future development are illogical and unreasonable	Amend the coastal environment provisions to exempt existing/established urban areas (including 40 Marsden Road, Paihia) from the restrictions on future development including: • maximum floor area of 300 m² • maximum extension of 20% • limits on excavation and filling • maximum height of 5 metres • additional controls on indigenous vegetation removal • subdivision as a discretionary activity		Accept in part
FS400.030	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.		
S386.017	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	SUB-R20	Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew oppose this This rule makes any subdivision within the CE a discretionary activity. In the proposed RPROZ, allotments must have a minimum lot size of 40ha to be a controlled activity, it is unclear how or why subdivision of lots of this size would require discretionary activity resource consent assessment solely based on the site being identified within the CE. This is considered to be overly restrictive, particularly when considering the minimum allotment sizes outlined in SUB-S1 of the PDP. Subdivision does not always require physical works and does necessarily propose or introduce built form. Regardless, the PDP already contains provisions for the management of built form, land disturbance and vegetation clearance (i.e., Rules CE-R1 and CE-R3, and standards CE-S1 and CE-S3). It is considered that the natural character of the coastal environment is already managed by elsewhere in the PDP and there is no need to duplicate the assessment here.	Delete rule, and review the provisions, incorporating either a targeted policy or assessment criteria in the rule SUB-R13.	Reject
S463.050	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-R20	Oppose	This generic rule unduly disregards, and is likely to unnecessarily complicate the realisation of, the orderly and planned subdivision of land in the Special Purpose Zones. For example, this rule would override the restricted discretionary consenting pathway for subdivision in the Golf Living subzone at Kauri Cliffs. This "trumping" of the KCZ provisions is unnecessary. The zone provides ample, specific, policy direction and assessment matters (with the amendments recommended in the submission) about the expected subdivision outcomes.	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) All zones Activity status: Discretionary a. This rule does not apply to land in the Kauri Cliffs Zone.	Reject
S386.016	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	SUB-R20	Oppose	This rule makes any subdivision within the CE a discretionary activity. In the proposed RPROZ, allotments must have a minimum lot size of 40ha to be a controlled activity, it is unclear how or why subdivision of lots of this size would require discretionary activity resource consent assessment solely based on the site being identified within the	Delete rule, and review the provisions, incorporating either a targeted policy or assessment criteria in the rule SUB-R13.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				CE. This is considered to be overly restrictive, particularly when considering the minimum allotment sizes outlined in SUB-S1 of the PDP. Subdivision does not always require physical works and does necessarily propose or introduce built form. Regardless, the PDP already contains provisions for the management of built form, land disturbance and vegetation clearance (i.e., Rules CE-R1 and CE-R3, and standards CE-S1 and CE-S3). It is considered that the natural character of the coastal environment is already managed by elsewhere in the PDP and there is no need to duplicate the assessment here.			
FS44.7	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Agree, that clarification should be sought that regardless of the lot size of the site or part of the site is located within the Coastal Environment the activity status is Discretionary. Contradict SUB-R3.	Allow in part		Reject
FS373.012	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support that subdivision of land in the Coastal Environment should not be a discretionary activity.	Allow	I seek that part of the submission point be allowed changing the activity status of Rule SUB-R20.	Reject
S167.062	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R20	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole.	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS405.037	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS368.086	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS361.028	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.424	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S222.056	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R20	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS405.039	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.			
FS368.090	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS361.031	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S243.080	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R20	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS405.040	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.			
FS368.092	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS361.032	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.638	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.652	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.674	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.055	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R20	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.			
FS405.042	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS368.094	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS361.034	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S364.061	Director-General of Conservation	SUB-R20	Support	The Director-General supports the activity status associated with Rule SUB-R20	Retain Rule SUB-R20		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	(Department of Conservation)						
FS405.043	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested retention of Rule SUB-R20 as Ballantyne & Agnew consider this to be overly restrictive, particularly when considering the minimum allotment sizes outlined in SUB-S1 of the PDP.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.035	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested retention of Rule SUB-R20 as Willowridge considers this to be a blunt approach to the management of subdivision within the CE, in the context of the minimum allotment size provisions provided in SUB-S1.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1142	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.201	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1156	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1178	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S431.089	John Andrew Riddell	SUB-R20	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend rule SUB-R20, subdivision of site within the Coastal Environment, so that it does not apply to subdivision within urban areas		Reject
FS332.089	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds			
S250.011	Willowridge Developments Limited	SUB-R20	Oppose	SUB-R20 is a blunt approach to the management of subdivision within the CE, in the context of the minimum allotment size provisions provide in SUB-S1. Subdivision does not necessary require physical works and does not always propose or introduce built form. The PDP already contains provisions for the management of built form, land disturbance and vegetation clearance (i.e., Rules CE-R1 and CE-R3, and standards CE-S1 and CE-S3). While it is understood that NZCPS requires the avoidance of adverse effects of subdivision on the natural character of the coastal environment, it is considered that this could be achieved through appropriate matters of control/discretion or assessment criteria elsewhere in the subdivision provisions, i.e., in SUB-R13 or SUB-P11.	Delete rule, and review the provisions, incorporating either a targeted policy or assessment criteria in the rule SUB-R13.		Reject
FS332.261	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivisions in the coastal environment should be discretionary.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS570.697	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.711	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.733	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S187.055	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R20	Support in part	The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					part of the existing site covered by the overlay).		
FS368.096	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS361.030	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S341.014	Ed and Inge Amsler	SUB-R20	Oppose	Subdivision in the Coastal Environment should align to the underlying zone provisions for subdivision allotment sizes. As a Discretionary Activity SUB-R20 includes no specific criteria to consider. It seems more appropriate for any subdivision within the Coastal Environment to assess the characteristics and qualities within that area, with specific assessment criteria as opposed to a blanket discretionary activity status.	Amend subdivision within a Coastal Environment to have alignment to the underlying zoning of a site and consider the intent of the zone and its minimum allotment sizes.		Reject
FS368.098	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend subdivision within a Coastal Environment to have alignment to the underlying zoning of a site and consider the intent of the zone and its minimum allotment sizes.	Allow	Amend	Reject
FS373.011	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	I support that a blanket discretionary activity status should not apply to subdivision of land within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Reject
S502.087	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-R20	Support in part	Clarification is sought that regardless of the lot size if the site or part of the site is located within the Coastal Environment the activity status is Discretionary.	Amend SUB-R20 to clarify if the site or part of the site is located within the Coastal Environment the activity status is Discretionary regardless of lot size.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS368.099	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend SUB-R20 to clarify if the site or part of the site is located within the Coastal Environment the activity status is Discretionary regardless of lot size	Allow	Amend SUB-R20	Reject
S364.062	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R21	Support	The Director-General supports the activity status associated with Rule SUB-R21	Retain Rule SUB-R21		Accept in part
FS372.006	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice	Allow	retain the rules as proposed.	Accept in part
FS570.1143	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.202	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1157	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1179	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.063	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R21	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole.	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: SUB-R21 Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS368.087	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
FS566.425	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S168.064	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R21	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS368.089	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
S222.057	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R21	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: SUB-R21 Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		
FS368.091	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
S243.081	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R21	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: SUB-R21 Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS368.093	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)			
FS570.639	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.653	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.675	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.056	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R21	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: SUB-R21 Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part
FS368.095	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
S187.056	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R21	Support in part	The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The	Amend Rule SUB-R21 as follows: SUB-R21 Subdivision of a site within Outstanding Natural Character Areas in the Coastal Environment (where any boundary of a		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay).		
FS368.097	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule SUB-R20 as follows: SUB-R20 Subdivision of a site within the Coastal Environment (excluding Outstanding Natural Character Areas) (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
S183.002	MLP LLC	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S226.002	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S226.003	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S227.002	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Company Limited			appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S228.002	Jayesh Govind and Others	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S229.002	Laurie Pearson	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S231.002	Ovisnagra Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S232.002	Tobias Groser	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S233.002	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S234.002	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S235.002	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S236.002	Connemara Black Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S237.002	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S238.002	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S239.002	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith,	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme,	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing			do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S240.002	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S241.002	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S352.002	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S368.035	Far North District Council	Overview	Support in part	Grammatical errors in the Overview	Amend the second sentence of the overview as follows Much of the ~~Districts~~ District's coastline while ensuring the ~~communities~~ community's health, safety and wellbeing.	Accept
S422.002	Maurice Dabbah	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S423.002	Bernard Sabrier	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S434.002	Francois Dotta	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S435.002	Elka Gouzer	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S511.088	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	It appears that the focus of the coastal environment chapter is on natural character, however a number of provisions refer broadly to the coastal environment and its values while others are specific to ONL and ONF. It is confusing that the policies cover both ONL and ONF but there are no rules that cover these features	Amend wording to reflect that the section covers other characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment, e.g. ONLs & ONFs Make it abundantly clear in an explanation somewhere that rules covering ONL and ONFs in the coastal environment are covered in the ONF and ONL chapter		Accept
FS67.80	The Shooting Box Limited		Support in part	The type of clarification sought is agreed with, however because the relief lacks specificity, it can not be supported in full.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS68.79	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part	The type of clarification sought is agreed with, however because the relief lacks specificity, it can not be supported in full.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS69.77	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support in part	The type of clarification sought is agreed with, however because the relief lacks specificity, it can not be supported in full.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS66.147	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The type of clarification sought is agreed with, however because the relief lacks specificity, it can not be supported in full.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS446.019	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support subject to appropriate provisions.	Allow	Amend wording to reflect that the section covers other characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment, e.g. ONLs & ONFs Make it abundantly clear in an explanation somewhere that rules covering ONL and ONFs in the coastal environment are covered in the ONF and ONL chapter.	Accept in part
FS547.023	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support to the extent that rules relating to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features are solely covered within the corresponding chapter. Allow subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept
FS164.088	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS305.020	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	No reasons stated.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate provisions.	Accept
FS570.1659	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1673	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1695	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S442.107	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Overview	Support in part	It appears that the focus of the coastal environment chapter is on natural character, however a number of provisions refer broadly to the coastal environment and its values while others are specific to ONL and ONF. It is confusing that the policies cover both ONL and ONF but there are no rules that cover these features.	Amend wording to reflect that the section covers other characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment, e.g. ONLs & ONFs Make it abundantly clear in an explanation somewhere that rules covering ONL and ONFs in the coastal environment are covered in the ONF and ONL chapter.		Accept
FS446.030	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support subject to appropriate provisions.	Allow in part	Amend wording to reflect that the section covers other characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment,	Accept in part
FS547.022	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support to the extent that rules relating to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features are solely covered within the corresponding chapter. Allow subject to drafting	Allow	Amend	Accept
FS305.019	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	No reasons stated.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate provisions.	Accept
FS346.718	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S230.002	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Coastal Environment Overlay to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
FS566.561	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
S82.009	Good Journey Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The objectives of the Coastal Environment Overlay are not supported by appropriate analysis, do not	Delete requirements for resource consent for building additions exceeding 20% in GFA, buildings exceeding one storey in height,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and do not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991.	reference to specific colours and reflectivity limitations in urban areas.	
S183.003	MLP LLC	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S227.003	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S228.003	Jayesh Govind and Others	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S229.003	Laurie Pearson	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S231.003	Ovisnegra Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S232.003	Tobias Groser	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S233.003	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S234.003	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S235.003	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S236.003	Connemara Black Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S237.003	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S238.003	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S239.003	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S240.003	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S241.003	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S352.003	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme,	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S422.003	Maurice Dabbah	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S423.003	Bernard Sabrier	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S345.005	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujlich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Objectives	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.		
S434.003	Francois Dotta	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S435.003	Elka Gouzer	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S442.156	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives are incomplete in that they do not address the protection, active management, and restoration of indigenous nature as part of protecting coastal natural character.	Insert additional objectives that address the protection, active management, and restoration of indigenous nature as part of protecting coastal natural character in the Far North District.		Reject
FS67.81	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The matter sought in the submission has been taken into account already in determining natural character values.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.105	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.106	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.56	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS68.80	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The matter sought in the submission has been taken into account already in determining natural character values.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.104	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.78	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The matter sought in the submission has been taken into account already in determining natural character values.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.101	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.149	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The matter sought in the submission has been taken into account already in determining natural character values.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.186	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed form of policy is very general and does not give effect to Policy 11 from from the NZCPS which has very precise prescription on the type of Indigenous vegetation and how it is to be managed in the coastal environment.	Disallow		Accept
FS346.767	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
S179.068	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Objectives	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that	Retain objectives		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area. CE- 02 C is particularly relevant for Russell where ribbon development is actively occurring along the Peninsula.			
FS51.100	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's coastal environs.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.030	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Support to the extent consistent with our primary submission. Agree consideration needs to be given to how such overlays apply or are integrated into urban zones.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S394.043	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Objectives	Support in part	Recognition and provision for tangata whenua culture, traditions and ancestral relationships must be achieved in managing the coastal environment.	Insert a new objective as follows: Land use and subdivision in the coastal environment recognises and provides for tangata whenua culture, traditions and their ancestral relationships.		Accept in part
FS106.11	Keringawai Evans		Support	I support the entire submission points in whole	Allow		Accept in part
FS363.043	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS538.043	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS537.043	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS536.043	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS535.043	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS533.043	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS532.043	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS531.043	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS530.043	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS529.043	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS528.043	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS527.043	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS526.043	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS525.043	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS524.043	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS523.043	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS522.043	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS521.043	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS520.043	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS519.043	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS518.043	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS517.043	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS516.043	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS515.043	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS514.043	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS513.043	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS512.043	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS511.043	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS510.043	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS509.043	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS508.043	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS507.043	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS506.043	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS505.043	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS504.043	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS503.043	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS502.043	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS501.043	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS500.043	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS499.043	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS498.043	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS497.043	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS496.043	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS495.043	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS494.043	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS493.043	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS492.043	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS491.043	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS490.043	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS489.043	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS487.043	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS486.043	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS485.043	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS483.043	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS482.043	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS481.043	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS480.043	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS479.043	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS478.043	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS477.043	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS476.043	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS475.043	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS474.043	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS473.043	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS472.043	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS471.043	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS470.043	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS469.043	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS468.043	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS467.043	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS466.043	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS465.043	Rangimarie Muru		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS464.043	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS463.043	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS462.043	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS461.043	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS460.043	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS459.043	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS458.043	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS457.043	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS456.043	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS455.043	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS454.043	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS453.043	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS452.043	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS451.043	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS450.043	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS447.043	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS440.043	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS439.043	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS436.043	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS435.043	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS434.043	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS433.043	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS432.043	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS431.043	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS430.043	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS429.043	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS428.043	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS427.043	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS426.043	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS425.043	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS423.043	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS422.043	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS421.043	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS420.043	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS418.043	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS417.043	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS416.043	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS415.043	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS408.043	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS388.043	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS387.043	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS386.043	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS385.043	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS382.043	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS381.043	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS380.043	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS379.043	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS378.043	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS365.043	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS360.043	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS359.043	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS358.043	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatiapi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS357.043	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS356.043	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS568.043	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS567.043	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS563.043	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS562.043	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS561.043	Ivan Wimoka Hataraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS560.043	Dylan Hataraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS559.043	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS558.043	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS557.043	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS556.043	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS555.043	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS553.043	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS552.043	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS551.043	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS546.043	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS545.043	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS544.043	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS178.043	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS413.043	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.027	John Andrew Riddell	Objectives	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert new Objective CE-04 as follows: To minimise adverse effects from activities in the coastal environment that cross the coastal marine area boundary		Accept in part
FS292.2	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support in part	The submitter supports policies which will minimise the adverse effects from activities (and in particular vehicle use on beaches) in the coastal environment and the boundary/interface with adjacent land.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS66.148	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission seeks a policy which does not properly give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.027	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.028	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G generally supports the relief as improving the completeness and readability of the CE provisions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S454.096	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Objectives	Not Stated	Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any area within the Far North District. Transpower is aware that new renewable energy generation such as solar and wind is being investigated in Northland and may require the location of electricity generation and transmission facilities in the Coastal Environment. Offshore wind generation, in particular, is likely to require transmission facilities to be located on land as close as possible to the offshore wind generation. Critical infrastructure such as the National Grid sometimes has a functional or operational need to locate in the Coastal Environment and needs to be provided for. A new objective is required to address this.	Insert new objective CE-O4 as follows: Infrastructure that has a functional or operational need to locate in the Coastal Environment is provided for.		Reject
FS36.062	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	Supports the relief sought, as infrastructure, such as the state highway, can have a functional or operational need to be located within the coastal environment especially where there are no reasonable alternatives. It is considered that infrastructure should be recognised in the objectives, which will also allow for the continued safe and efficient operation of the state highway and associated infrastructure.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS111.116	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support the new objective to provide for the functional or operational need for infrastructure to locate in the coastal environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.039	Royal Forest and Bird		Oppose	The amendment sought does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.						
FS369.447	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the new objective referencing the functional or operational need for infrastructure to locate in the coastal environment.	Allow		Reject
S565.002	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Objectives	Support in part	The report provided by Melean Absolum Limited, that supports the Coastal Environment s32 Report prepared by Council, only suggests potential rules for the Coastal Environment within an urban area. There is no detailed evidence provided within either report to support these 'suggestions'. The PDP includes to rules such as a 5m height limit, 300m2 building / floor area coverage, and 400m2 indigenous vegetation and earthworks limits within an urban area. There is limited rationale as to why and how these provisions were selected. it is not clear why 5m was selected, or why this height limit is appropriate. No specific locality assessments have been undertaken specifically to suggest that this is appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend the objectives within the Coastal Environment to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.		Accept in part
FS407.007	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported, and we concur that the analyses underpinning the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS348.218	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject
S451.012	Pacific Eco-Logic	Objectives	Support in part	The objectives are incomplete in that they do not address the protection, active management, and restoration of indigenous nature as part of protecting coastal natural character	Insert additional objectives that address the protection, active management, and restoration of indigenous nature as part of protecting coastal natural character in the Far North District.		Reject
FS393.026	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Oppose	The scope, content and effect of the additional objectives is not known.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.199	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.1517	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1531	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1553	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S230.003	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
FS566.562	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
S168.066	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and insert the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effect to the NZCPS.	values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of climate change; and i. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S386.009	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-O1	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support the intention of this objective as it is considered to align with the RPS and Section 6(a) of the RMA.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
S167.066	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-02, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision).	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-02 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety;b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; andd. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; ande. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					climate change; andi. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; andj. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements.k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS143.20	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that this coastal environment objective should recognise and provide for the full range of sustainable land uses in the coastal environment (including those already consented). In particular, the objective should enable people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety.	Allow		Reject
FS393.015	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS401.041	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS368.0100	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
FS566.428	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
S421.181	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-O1	Support in part	Objective CE-O1 as currently worded is not consistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of the objective to be consistent with section 6 and to reflect protection of natural character from only inappropriate activities rather than all.	Amend Objective CE-O1 as follows: The natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection from inappropriate use, development, and subdivision for current and future generations. or wording with similar intent		Accept in part
FS143.63	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that Objective CE-O1 as currently worded is not consistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.141	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS332.233	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS354.144	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The change sought is more consistent with s6 of the RMA so is supported.	Allow	Allow S421.181	Accept in part
FS570.1413	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.415	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1427	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1449	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S187.058	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: CE-O1 lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment, and together with CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and i. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS446.020	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support subject to appropriate wording to guide subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment to ensure the provisions enable the varying character of land within the coastal environment to be recognized. Many parts of the coastal environment have rural residential or urban characteristics.	Allow in part	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-02 and replace	Reject
FS305.021	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support subject to appropriate wording to guide subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment to ensure the provisions enable the varying character of land within the coastal environment to be recognized. Many parts of the coastal environment have rural residential or urban characteristics.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject
FS368.102	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-02 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present;	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
S222.058	Wendover Two Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-02, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and insert with the following: CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of climate change; andi. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; andj. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements.k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS47.014	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part
FS368.104	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
FS569.038	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose all these submissions because they seek to replace PA-P2 as drafted in the PDP with its criteria requiring the creation of Esplanade Reserves	Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2	Accept in part
S463.051	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	This objective is almost identical to proposed objective NATC-O1 and displays the same issues in that it appears to be a recombination of RMA s6(a) with the inclusion of a vague reference to "long-term" protection and a superfluous reference to "current and future generations". However, the objective fails to recognise the RMA s6(a) distinction regarding protection from inappropriate activities. The objective appears to envisage outright "preservation and protection" without recognition that some activities and the associated effects, may not necessarily be inappropriate.	Delete Objective CE-O1		Accept in part
FS405.061	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point as CEO1 is considered to align with the RPS and Section 6(a) of the RMA.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.054	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the submission point as CE-O1 is considered to align with the RPS	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and Section 6(a) of the RMA.		
S243.084	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-O1	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety;b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; andc. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; andd. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; ande. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; andi. Protects and	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS368.106	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and - Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.642	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.656	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.678	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S333.058	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-O1	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and replace with the following: <i>Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and</i>		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and i. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.</i>		
FS368.108	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values;	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
S250.013	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-O1	Support	This objective as it is considered to align with the RPS and Section 6(a) of the RMA.	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
FS570.699	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.713	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.735	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.059	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-O2	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	Delete Objective CE-O2		Reject
S463.052	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-O2	Oppose	Sub-clause (b) would, in the case of a development or activity in a previously undeveloped part of the coastal environment, present a bar to approval. In another scenario, it would require a new land use	Amend point b. of Objective CE-O2 as follows: b. is ~~consistent~~ compatible with the surrounding land use;		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to be "consistent" with surrounding land uses, even of the latter are undesirable. WBF recommends replacing the term "consistent" with the term "compatible"			
S159.071	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-O2	Support	Land use which is consistent with the surrounding land use is appropriate	Retain Objective CE-O2		Accept in part
FS151.239	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.233	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.247	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.269	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S396.020	Matauri X Incorporation	CE-O2	Support	Matauri X submit that the Coastal Environment provisions do not appropriately recognise tangata whenua needs for ancestral use of whenua maori as provided for in CE-O2. There are no specific provisions which relate back to this objective, so it is unclear how this will be achieved in practice through the provisions. Additional provisions are considered warranted which revolve around the expectation that tangata whenua will develop their landholdings in an appropriate manner.	retain CE-O2 specifically ...e. recognises tangata whenua needs for ancestral use of whenua Maori		Accept in part
FS449.030	The Proprietors of Tapuaetahi Incorporation		Support	Matauri X submit that the Coastal Environment provisions do not appropriately recognise tangata whenua needs for ancestral use of whenua maori as provided for in CE-O2. There are no specific provisions which relate back to this objective, so it is unclear how this will be achieved in practice through the provisions. Additional provisions are considered warranted which revolve around the expectation that tangata whenua will develop their	Allow	retain CE-O2 specifically ...e. recognises tangata whenua needs for ancestral use of whenua Maori	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				landholdings in an appropriate manner.			
S511.089	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-O2	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS164.089	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1660	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1674	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1696	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S356.094	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	CE-O2	Neutral	Subclause (b) is unclear and should be deleted.	Amend as follows: Land use and subdivision in the coastal environment: a. preserves the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment; b. ~~is consistent with the surrounding land use;~~ c. ...		Accept in part
FS354.145	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete clause b. is consistent with the surrounding land use. HortNZ	Disallow	Disallow S356.094	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				seeks retention of this clause as it provides a context for land use in the surrounding areas.		
S167.067	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-02	Oppose	This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-02, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision).	Delete Objectives CE-01 and CE-02 and replace with the following: Objective CE-01 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety;b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; andd. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; ande. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of climate change; andi. Protects and	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS368.101	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and - Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.429	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
S187.099	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-O2	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: CE-O1 lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment, and together with CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and i. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		Reject
FS368.103	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
S222.059	Wendover Two Limited	CE-O2	Support	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single	Delete Objectives CE-O2 and insert with the following: CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	the biodiversity values present; andd. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; ande. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of climate change; andi. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; andj. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements.k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS368.105	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
S243.085	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-O2	Oppose	Objective CE-O1 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-O2, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effects to the NZCPS.	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; ande. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; andf. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; andg. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; andh. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; andi. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; andj. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements.k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS368.107	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.			
FS570.643	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.657	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.679	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S168.067	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-02	Oppose	Objective CE-01 seeks that the natural character of the coastal environment is identified and managed to ensure its long-term preservation and protection for current and future generations. This objective lacks specificity as to the outcome sought for the coastal environment and, together with Objective CE-02, fails to take into account the full scope of resources in the coastal environment and the range of existing and potential new sustainable land uses able to be supported in the	Delete Objectives CE-01 and CE-02 and insert the following: Objective CE-01 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety;		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				coastal environment (including opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character through land use and subdivision). This submission seeks both objectives both be deleted and replaced with a consolidated single objective which sets out a clear and specific outcome for resources in the coastal environment, and which gives effect to the NZCPS.	b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the longterm projected effects of climate change; and i. Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.		
FS368.109	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Objectives CE-O1 and CE-O2 and replace with the following: Objective CE-O1 Subdivision, use and development in the Coastal Environment: a. Enables people and their communities to provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and their health and safety; b. Maintains or restores the integrity, form, functioning and resilience of the Coastal Environment; and c. Protects the indigenous biodiversity values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the biodiversity values present; and d. Preserves the natural character of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural character present; and e. Protects natural features and landscapes values of the Coastal Environment in relation to the level of natural feature and landscape values present; and f. Recognises and provides for the relationship of tāngata whenua with the Coastal Environment; and g. Maintains and enhances public open space and recreation opportunities in the Coastal Environment; and h. Manages coastal hazard risks, including the long-term projected effects of climate change; and Protects and enhances historic heritage values; and j. Avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of development and enabling consolidation of existing settlements. k. Where appropriate, promotes opportunities for restoration or rehabilitation of modified or degraded areas of natural character.	Allow	Delete Objectives noted	Reject
S442.108	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-O2	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.719	Royal Forest and Bird		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S511.090	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-O3	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.090	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1661	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1675	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1697	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S442.109	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-O3	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.720	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.		
S82.010	Good Journey Limited	Policies	Oppose	The policies of the Coastal Environment Overlay are not supported by appropriate analysis, do not meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and do not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991.	Delete requirements for resource consent for building additions exceeding 20% in GFA, buildings exceeding one storey in height, reference to specific colours and reflectivity limitations in urban areas.	Accept in part
S183.004	MLP LLC	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S226.004	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S227.004	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S228.004	Jayesh Govind and Others	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S229.004	Laurie Pearson	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S231.004	Ovisnegra Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S232.004	Tobias Groser	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S233.004	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S234.004	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S235.004	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Gordon Chandler			appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S236.004	Connemara Black Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S237.004	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S238.004	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S239.004	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S240.004	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S241.004	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S352.004	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S422.004	Maurice Dabbah	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S423.004	Bernard Sabrier	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S345.006	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Policies	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.		
S434.004	Francois Dotta	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S435.004	Elka Gouzer	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
S431.033	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert a new policy as per Policy 4.6.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Reject
FS67.82	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	These outcomes are implemented by the proposed policies (as sought to be amended by the the further submitters primary submission)	Disallow		Accept
FS68.81	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	These outcomes are implemented by the proposed policies (as sought to be amended by the the further submitters primary submission)	Disallow		Accept
FS69.79	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	These outcomes are implemented by the proposed policies (as sought to be amended by the the further submitters primary submission)	Disallow		Accept
FS66.150	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	These outcomes are implemented by the proposed policies (as sought to be amended by the the further submitters primary submission)	Disallow		Accept
FS332.033	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS404.033	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G supports the clear and directive drafting in RPS policies 4.6.1 and 5.1.2. These give effect to the NZCPS and are appropriate for inclusion the FNDP in the absence of alternative drafting to address these issues.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S431.034	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Insert a new policy as per Policy 5.1.2 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Reject
FS67.83	The Shooting Box Limited		Support in part	The submission point is generally agreed with, however the specific wording has not been provided and the outcome may be better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS68.82	P S Yates Family Trust		Support in part	The submission point is generally agreed with, however the specific wording has not been provided and the outcome may be better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS69.80	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support in part	The submission point is generally agreed with, however the specific wording has not been provided and the outcome may be better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS66.151	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The submission point is generally agreed with, however the specific wording has not been provided and the outcome may be better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.034	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.034	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G supports the clear and directive drafting in RPS policies 4.6.1 and 5.1.2. These give effect to the NZCPS and are appropriate for inclusion the FNDP in the absence of alternative drafting to address these issues.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.035	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Insert a new policy as per Policy 10.4.1 of the Operative District Plan, as follows: That the Council only allows appropriate subdivision, use and development in the coastal environment. Appropriate subdivision, use and development is that where the activity generally: 1. Recognises and provides for those features and elements that contribute to the natural character of an area that may require preservation, restoration or enhancement; and 2. is in a location and of a scale and design that minimises adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment; and 3. has adequate services provided in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the coastal environment and does not adversely affect the safety and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					efficiency of the roading network; and 4. avoids, as far as is practicable, adverse effects which are more than minor on heritage features, outstanding landscapes, cultural values, significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, amenity values of public land and waters and the natural functions and systems of the coastal environment; and 5. promotes the protection, and where appropriate restoration and enhancement, of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and 6. recognises and provides for the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga; and (g) where appropriate, provides for and, where possible, enhances public access to and along the coastal marine area; and	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					7. gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.		
FS67.84	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The submission does not give effect to the NZCPS with the outcomes sought better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.52	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The submission does not give effect to the NZCPS with the outcomes sought better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in Bentzen Farm Limited's primary submission (as supported by the further submitter).	Disallow		Accept
FS68.83	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The submission does not give effect to the NZCPS with the outcomes sought better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.81	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The submission does not give effect to the NZCPS with the outcomes sought better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.152	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission does not give effect to the NZCPS with the outcomes sought better realised by the submission points on CE-01 and CE-02 sought in the further submitter's primary submission.	Disallow		Accept
FS332.035	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S431.037	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert a new policy as per Policy 10.4.12 of the Operative District Plan, as follows: That the adverse effects of development on the natural character and amenity values of the coastal environment will be minimised through: (a) the siting of buildings relative to the skyline, ridges,		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					headlands and natural features; (b) the number of buildings and intensity of development;(c) the colour and reflectivity of buildings; (d) the landscaping (including planting) of the site; (e) the location and design of vehicle access, manoeuvring and parking areas		
FS67.85	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought incorrectly seeks to 'minimise' adverse effects on natural character and amenity of the coastal environment which does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.53	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The relief sought incorrectly seeks to 'minimise' adverse effects on natural character and amenity of the coastal environment which does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.84	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought incorrectly seeks to 'minimise' adverse effects on natural character and amenity of the coastal environment which does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.82	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought incorrectly seeks to 'minimise' adverse effects on natural character and amenity of the coastal environment which does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS292.1	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support in part	The submitter supports the insertion of objectives, policies and rules which will better manage and minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment, and at boundary/interface with adjacent land, and in particular to the location and design of vehicle access, manoeuvring and parking areas.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS66.153	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought incorrectly seeks to 'minimise' adverse effects on natural character and amenity of the coastal environment which does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.037	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S431.038	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Insert a new policy as per Policy 10.6.4.3 of the Operative District Plan, as follows: Subdivision, use and development shall preserve and where possible enhance, restore and rehabilitate the character of the zone in regards to s6 matters, and shall avoid adverse effects as far as practicable by using techniques including: (a) clustering or grouping development within areas where there is the least impact on natural character and its elements such as indigenous vegetation, landforms, rivers, streams and wetlands, and coherent natural patterns; (b) minimising the visual impact of buildings, development, and associated vegetation clearance and earthworks, particularly as seen from public land and the coastal marine area; (c) providing for, through siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions, legal public right of access to and use of the foreshore and any esplanade areas; (d) through siting of buildings and development, design of subdivisions and provision of access, that recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori with their		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					culture, traditions and taonga including concepts of mauri, tapu, mana, wehi and karakia and the important contribution Maori culture makes to the character of the District; (e) providing planting of indigenous vegetation in a way that links existing habitats of indigenous fauna and provides the opportunity for the extension, enhancement or creation of habitats for indigenous fauna, including mechanisms to exclude pests; (f) protecting historic heritage through the siting of buildings and development and design of subdivisions.		
FS67.86	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The proposed policy does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS143.54	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The proposed policy does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.85	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The proposed policy does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.83	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The proposed policy does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS88.86	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS66.154	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed policy does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS332.038	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.157	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	The PDP policies do not address the protection of (terrestrial and freshwater) coastal indigenous ecological integrity and function, nor the protection of coastal indigenous ecological community structure and composition. Especially important is the protection of relatively intact indigenous forests, shrublands, coastal cliffs communities, coastal wetlands (including saltmarsh, salt meadow/herb field and freshwater wetlands), and dunelands. These are important components of coastal natural character and are often important for their biodiversity values. Notwithstanding policy CEP8, NZCPS 2010 policies 11, 13 and 14 need to be more completely addressed in the plan's coastal environment policies.	Insert additional policies addressing the need to: 1. Protect indigenous coastal forests, coastal shrublands, coastal cliffs communities, coastal and freshwater wetlands and dunelands 2. Protect coastal wetlands (including saltmarsh, salt meadow/herb field and freshwater wetlands) from activities inland of the CMA in the Far North District 3. The need to protect isolated important indigenous elements such as large pohutukawa and puriri trees, and fringing pohutukawa and other native trees in Northland's harbours and bays (e.g., Bay of Islands). 4. The need for coastal ecosystems (such as saltmarsh, salt meadow and floodplain wetlands) to be able to migrate inland as sea levels rise. Such policies may include promoting restrictions on new activities that would impede such landward migration of coastal ecotones.		Reject
FS67.87	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The natural character values of the environments referred to in the submission have already been identified by natural character mapping.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.86	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The natural character values of the environments referred to in the submission have already been identified by natural character mapping.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.84	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The natural character values of the environments referred to in the submission have already been identified by natural character mapping.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.155	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The natural character values of the environments referred to in the submission have already been identified by natural character mapping.	Disallow		Accept
FS346.768	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
S179.069	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries	Retain Policies		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.			
FS51.101	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's coastal environs.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.031	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Support to the extent consistent with our primary submission. Agree consideration needs to be given to how such overlays apply or are integrated into urban zones.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S454.099	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	A number of policies set out the activities that are to be enabled in the General Residential zone. Transpower supports the intent of these policies, however critical infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is not clearly provided for. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any zone within the Far North District. Transpower is aware that new renewable energy generation such as solar and wind is being investigated in Northland and may require the location of electricity generation and transmission facilities in the Coastal Environment. Offshore wind generation, in particular, is likely to require transmission facilities to be located on land as close as possible to the offshore wind generation. A new policy is required to make it explicit that infrastructure such as the National Grid is enabled in the Coastal Environment zone.	Insert new policy CE-Px as follows: Enable infrastructure that has a functional and operational need to locate in the Coastal Environment.		Reject
FS111.117	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support the new policy to provide for the functional or operational need for infrastructure to locate in the coastal environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.042	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendment sought does not give effect to the NZCPS and is overly enabling to ensure appropriate management of effects.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.448	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the new objective referencing the functional or operational need for infrastructure to locate in the coastal environment.	Allow		Reject
S565.003	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Policies	Support in part	The report provided by Melean Absolum Limited, that supports the Coastal Environment s32 Report prepared by Council, only suggests potential rules for the Coastal Environment within an urban area. There is no detailed evidence provided within either report to support these 'suggestions'. The PDP includes to rules such as a 5m height limit, 300m2 building / floor area coverage, and 400m2 indigenous vegetation and earthworks limits within an urban area. There is limited rationale as to why and how these provisions were selected. it is not clear why 5m was selected, or why this height limit is appropriate. No specific locality assessments have been undertaken specifically to suggest that this is appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend the policies within the Coastal Environment to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.		Accept in part
FS547.024	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought to amend the Proposed District Plan provisions to better facilitate development within existing coastal towns. Paihia, including the further submitters land, is a developed area, and therefore the settlement comprises of a less sensitive environment than less densely populated coastal areas. This should be reflected in the objective and policy framework and rule provisions.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS348.219	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S431.036	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert a new policy as per Policy 10.4.7 of the Operative District Plan, as follows: To ensure the adverse effects of land-based activities associated with maritime facilities including mooring areas and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					boat ramps are avoided, remedied or mitigated through the provision of adequate services, including where appropriate: (a) parking; (b) rubbish disposal; (c) waste disposal; (d) dinghy racks		
FS332.036	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S451.013	Pacific Eco-Logic	Policies	Support in part	The PDP policies do not address the protection of (terrestrial and freshwater) coastal indigenous ecological integrity and function, nor the protection of coastal indigenous ecological community structure and composition. Especially important is the protection of relatively intact indigenous forests, shrublands, coastal cliffs communities, coastal wetlands (including saltmarsh, salt meadow/herb field and freshwater wetlands), and dunelands. These are important components of coastal natural character and are often important for their biodiversity values. Notwithstanding policy CEP8, NZCPS 2010 policies 11, 13 and 14 need to be more completely addressed in the plan's coastal environment policies.	Insert additional policies addressing the need to: 1. Protect indigenous coastal forests, coastal shrublands, coastal cliffs communities, coastal and freshwater wetlands and dunelands 2. Protect coastal wetlands (including saltmarsh, salt meadow/herb field and freshwater wetlands) from activities inland of the CMA in the Far North District 3. The need to protect isolated important indigenous elements such as large pohutukawa and puriri trees, and fringing pohutukawa and other native trees in Northland's harbours and bays (e.g., Bay of Islands). 4. The need for coastal ecosystems (such as saltmarsh, salt meadow and floodplain wetlands) to be able to migrate inland as sea levels rise. Such policies may include promoting restrictions on new activities that would impede such landward migration of coastal ecotones.		Reject
FS332.200	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.1518	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1532	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1554	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S359.001	Northland Regional Council	Policies	Support in part	There are often difficulties in ensuring marine activities have the supporting land-based facilities required.	Amend the Plan to complement the cross-boundary matters section by incorporating policy in the coastal environment and infrastructure sections that seek subdivision, land use and development that is compatible with and where practicable complements use/activity in the coastal marine area.		Accept in part
FS570.1037	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.462	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1051	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1073	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S394.045	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Policies	Oppose	Adverse effects on cultural values must be managed appropriately, not just considered.	Insert a new policy as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on cultural values.		Reject
FS363.045	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS538.045	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS537.045	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS536.045	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS535.045	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS533.045	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS532.045	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS531.045	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS530.045	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS529.045	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS528.045	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS527.045	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS526.045	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS525.045	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS524.045	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS523.045	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS522.045	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS521.045	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS520.045	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS519.045	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS518.045	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS517.045	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS516.045	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS515.045	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS514.045	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS513.045	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS512.045	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS511.045	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS510.045	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS509.045	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS508.045	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS507.045	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS506.045	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS505.045	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS504.045	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS503.045	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS502.045	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS501.045	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS500.045	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS499.045	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS498.045	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS497.045	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS496.045	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS495.045	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS494.045	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS493.045	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS492.045	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS491.045	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS490.045	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS489.045	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS487.045	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS486.045	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS485.045	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS483.045	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS482.045	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS481.045	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS480.045	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS479.045	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS478.045	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS477.045	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS476.045	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS475.045	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS474.045	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS473.045	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS472.045	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS471.045	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS470.045	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS469.045	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS468.045	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS467.045	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS466.045	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS465.045	Rangimarie Muru		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS464.045	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS463.045	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS462.045	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS461.045	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS460.045	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS459.045	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS458.045	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS457.045	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS456.045	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS455.045	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS454.045	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS453.045	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS452.045	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS451.045	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS450.045	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS447.045	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS440.045	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS439.045	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS436.045	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS435.045	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS434.045	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS433.045	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS432.045	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS431.045	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS430.045	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS429.045	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS428.045	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS427.045	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS426.045	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS425.045	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS423.045	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS422.045	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS421.045	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS420.045	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS418.045	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS417.045	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS416.045	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS415.045	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS408.045	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS388.045	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS387.045	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS386.045	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS385.045	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS382.045	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS381.045	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS380.045	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS379.045	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS378.045	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS365.045	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS360.045	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS359.045	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS358.045	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatiapi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS357.045	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS356.045	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS568.045	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS567.045	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS563.045	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS562.045	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS561.045	Ivan Wimoka Hataraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS560.045	Dylan Hataraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS559.045	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS558.045	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS557.045	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS556.045	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS555.045	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS553.045	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS552.045	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS551.045	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS546.045	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS545.045	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS544.045	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS178.045	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS413.045	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S230.004	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and	Amend the Policies of the Coastal Environment Chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
FS566.563	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
S386.010	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-P1	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew support the identification methods and intention of this policy as it aligns with Policy 4.5.1 and Method 4.5.4 of the RPS.	Retain as notified.		Accept
S421.182	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-P1	Oppose	Federated Farmers does not support Policy CE-P1 as it uses the identification and mapping of high character areas. Throughout this submission we have consistently sought the deletion of the use and references to high character areas.	Amend Policy CE-P1 to remove all references to high character areas		Reject
FS196.140	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS349.005	Northland Regional Council		Oppose	The NZ Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement both require identification and management of high natural character	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept
FS332.234	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS354.146	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks the deletion of 'high' natural character. Outstanding natural character is provided for in the NZCPS, but there is no requirement to identify 'high' natural character. The focus should be to give effect to the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow S421.182	Reject
FS570.1414	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.416	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1428	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1450	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S356.095	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	CE-P1	Support	not stated	Retain CE-P1 as notified		Accept
FS405.062	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to retain CE-P1 as the intention of this policy aligns with Policy 4.5.1 and Method 4.5.4 of the RPS.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS346.050	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	Provision will assist plan users	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS361.053	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point to retain CE-P1 as the intention of this policy aligns with Policy 4.5.1 and Method 4.5.4 of the RPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S250.014	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-P1	Support	The identification methods and intention of this policy aligns with Policy 4.5.1 and Method 4.5.4 of the RPS.	Retain as notified.		Accept
FS570.700	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.714	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.736	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S333.060	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"values" in APP-1.	on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	
S168.068	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as ...	Accept
S187.059	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	Accept
S356.096	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	CE-P2	Support	not stated	Retain CE-P2 as notified	Accept in part
S222.060	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	Accept
S167.068	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character;	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					b. ONL; c. ONF.		
FS143.21	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The submission point is agreed with that the policy should recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values".	Allow		Accept
FS566.430	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
S421.183	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-P2	Support in part	Objective CE-P2 as currently worded is not consistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Federated Farmers seeks the amendment of the policy to be consistent with section 6 and to reflect protection of natural character from only inappropriate activities rather than all.	Amend Objective CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of inappropriate development , land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: ... or wording with similar intent		Reject
FS143.64	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Objective CE-P2 as currently worded is not consistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991	Allow		Reject
FS196.139	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS393.025	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The reason in the Original Submission No 421	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS534.043	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees that the notified drafting of this policy does not accurately reflect the more qualified obligation that appears in RMA s6(a) and NZCPS Policy 13(1)(a) and (1)(b) and Policy 15(a) and (b) to manage inappropriate activities, rather than avoiding all adverse effects.	Allow	Amend Objective CE-P2	Reject
FS570.1415	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.417	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
FS566.1429	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1451	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S454.097	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	CE-P2	Not Stated	A consequential amendment to this policy is required to ensure that the FNPDP gives effect to the NPSET as set out in the submission point on I-P2 above.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Subject to I-Px , Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.		Reject
FS372.034	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	Qualifying this policy in the manner proposed is inconsistent with the relevant policies in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement and in the Infrastructure chapter of the proposed District Plan.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS346.040	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendment sought does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.449	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports amendments to give effect to the NPSET.	Allow		Reject
S243.086	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P2	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment identified as: a. outstanding natural character;		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					b. ONL; c. ONF.		
FS47.011	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Reject
FS569.035	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose all these submissions because they seek to replace PA-P2 as drafted in the PDP with its criteria requiring the creation of Esplanade Reserves	Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2	Reject
FS570.644	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.658	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.680	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S511.091	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P2	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.091	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1662	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1676	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1698	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S511.098	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P2	Support in part	Generally support the directive wording of these policies. However, when APP1 is analysed it is slightly confusing between ONL, ONFs, natural character and the Coastal Environment. Certain 'Areas/Characteristics' seem to apply to natural character, natural features and landscapes. However it is difficult to resolve which parts of APP1 should apply and what characteristics and qualities are being protected or preserved. This is because the ONL and ONFs only discuss values, not characteristics. The criteria for Coastal Environment discuss characteristics. These characteristics of the Coastal Environment do not seem to include ONL, ONFs, and outstanding natural character in APP1	Amend to clarify the relationship between all the elements of APP-1 and P2 and P3 to make sure all the applicable values, characteristics and qualities are protected and preserved as required.		Accept
FS164.098	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS570.1669	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1683	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1705	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S364.063	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P2	Support in part	This policy is generally supported by the Director-General as being consistent with Policies 13 and 15 of the NZCPS; however, the coastal environment has value in of itself, not just in characteristics and qualities and the wording should reflect this.	Change the wording of Policy CE-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the ~~characteristics and qualities of the~~ coastal environment identified as: a.outstanding natural character; b.ONL; c.ONF.		Accept in part
FS548.117	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS354.147	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Objective 2 of the NZCPS seeks to recognise the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character, yet the submitter seeks to delete 'characteristics and qualities' which is inconsistent with the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow S364.063	Accept in part
FS570.1144	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.203	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1158	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1180	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.110	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P2	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.721	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
S442.117	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P2	Support in part	Generally support the directive wording of these policies. However, when APP1 is analysed it is slightly confusing between ONL, ONFs, natural character and the Coastal Environment. Certain 'Areas/Characteristics' seem to apply to natural character, natural features and landscapes. However it is difficult to resolve which parts of APP1 should apply and what characteristics and qualities are being protected or preserved. This is because the ONL and ONFs only discuss values, not characteristics. The criteria for Coastal Environment discuss characteristics. These characteristics of the Coastal Environment do not seem to include ONL, ONFs, and outstanding natural character in APP1.	Amend to clarify the relationship between all the elements of APP-1 and P2 and P3 to make sure all the applicable values, characteristics and qualities are protected and preserved as required.		Accept
FS346.728	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S333.061	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S168.069	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as ...	Accept
S187.060	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	Accept
S222.061	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	Accept
S167.069	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.22	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The submission point is agreed with that the policy should recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values".	Allow		Accept
FS566.431	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
S454.098	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	CE-P3	Not Stated	A consequential amendment to this policy is required to ensure that the FNPD gives effect to the NPSET as set out in the submission point on I-P2 above.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: (inferred) Subject to I-Px , Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.		Reject
FS372.035	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	Qualifying this policy in the manner proposed is inconsistent with the relevant policies in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement and in the Infrastructure chapter of the proposed District Plan.	Disallow	disallow the submission point	Accept
FS346.041	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendment sought does not give effect to the NZCPS.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.450	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports amendments to give effect to the NPSET.	Allow		Reject
S511.092	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P3	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.092	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	
FS570.1663	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1677	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1699	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S511.099	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P3	Support in part	Generally support the directive wording of these policies. However, when APP1 is analysed it is slightly confusing between ONL, ONFs, natural character and the Coastal Environment. Certain 'Areas/Characteristics' seem to apply to natural character, natural features and landscapes. However it is difficult to resolve which parts of APP1 should apply and what characteristics and qualities are being protected or preserved. This is because the ONL and ONFs only discuss values, not characteristics. The criteria for Coastal Environment discuss characteristics. These characteristics of the Coastal Environment do not seem to include ONL, ONFs, and outstanding natural character in APP1	Amend to clarify the relationship between all the elements of APP-1 and P2 and P3 to make sure all the applicable values, characteristics and qualities are protected and preserved as required.		Accept
FS164.099	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1670	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1684	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1706	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S364.064	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P3	Support in part	Policy CE-P3 is generally supported by the Director-General as being consistent with Policies 13 and 15 of the NZCPS; however, the coastal environment has value in of itself, not just in characteristics and qualities and the wording should reflect this.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the natural character, natural features, and natural landscapes (including seascapes) characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a.outstanding natural character; b.ONL; c.ONF.		Accept in part
FS548.118	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS354.148	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	Objective 2 of the NZCPS seeks to recognise the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character, yet the submitter seeks to delete 'characteristics and qualities' which is inconsistent with the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow S364.064	Accept in part
FS570.1145	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.204	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1159	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1181	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S356.097	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	CE-P3	Oppose	It is considered clearer and more consistent with the NZCPS to refer to "natural character" of the Coastal environment.	Amend as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the ~~characteristics and qualities~~ natural character of the coastal environment ~~not identified as:~~ ~~outstanding natural character;~~ a. ONL; ~~c. ONF.~~		Accept in part
FS346.051	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendment sought is inconsistent with the NZCPS.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S463.053	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-P3	Oppose	It is considered inappropriate to require all significant adverse effects to be avoided in areas of the coastal environment outside of "significant" (in a RMA section 6 sense) ONC, ONL and ONF areas. It is appropriate to facilitate an assessment of the merits of proposals with such effects rather than requiring outright avoidance as a first principle policy setting.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: CE-P3 ~~Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other~~ Manage any adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment in locations not identified as: a. outstanding natural character;		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					b. ONL; and c. ONF.		
FS368.110	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: CE-P3 Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other Manage any adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment in locations not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; and c. ONF	Allow	Amend Policy	Reject
S243.087	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P3	Support in part	An amendment is sought to the policy to recognise that some of the overlays referenced identify "values" in APP-1.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; c. ONF.		Accept
FS570.645	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.659	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.681	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S442.111	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P3	Support	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.722	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S442.118	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P3	Support in part	Generally support the directive wording of these policies. However, when APP1 is analysed it is slightly confusing between ONL, ONFs, natural character and the Coastal Environment. Certain 'Areas/Characteristics' seem to apply to natural character, natural features and landscapes. However it is difficult to resolve which parts of APP1 should apply and what characteristics and qualities are being protected or preserved. This is because the ONL and ONFs only discuss values, not characteristics. The criteria for Coastal Environment discuss characteristics. These characteristics of the Coastal Environment do not seem to include ONL, ONFs, and outstanding natural character in APP1.	Amend to clarify the relationship between all the elements of APP-1 and P2 and P3 to make sure all the applicable values, characteristics and qualities are protected and preserved as required.		Accept
FS346.729	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S427.013	Kapiro Residents Association	CE-P4	Support in part	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Retain Coastal Environment Policy CE-P4 [inferred].		Accept in part
S463.054	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-P4	Oppose	Sub-clause (a) appears to disregard the presence of Special Purpose Zones, some of which (like the KCZ) were specifically established to provide for various developments beyond the boundaries of the district's towns.	Amend Policy CE-P4 as follows: CE-P4 Preserve the visual qualities, character and integrity of the coastal environment by: a. consolidating land use and subdivision around existing urban centres and rural settlements or in locations provided for by Special Purposes Zones ; and b. avoiding sprawl or unplanned sporadic patterns of development.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS66.156	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The relief sought add better precision.	Allow		Reject
S511.093	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P4	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.093	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1664	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1678	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1700	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S431.028	John Andrew Riddell	CE-P4	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend point b. of Policy CE-P4 as follows: b. avoiding sprawling or sporadic patterns of development in the rural coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS332.028	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
S338.038	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	CE-P4	Not Stated	We support policies/rules that seek to avoid urban/residential sprawl in rural and coastal areas. Sprawling development and residential growth in rural areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas. We support Coastal environment policy CE-P4 which states 'avoiding sprawl or sporadic patterns of development'.	Retain Policy CE-P4 and include similar provisions/rules in other zones/chapters		Accept in part
FS277.55	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment and community	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.976	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.990	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1012	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S364.065	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P4	Support	Policy CE-P4 is generally supported by the Director-General as being consistent with Policy 6 of the NZCPS	Retain Policy CE-P4		Accept in part
FS570.1146	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.205	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1160	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1182	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S529.021	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	CE-P4	Support	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Retain Coastal Environment Policy CE-P4 [inferred].		Accept in part
FS570.1911	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1925	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1947	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.112	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P4	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.723	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
S522.013	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	CE-P4	Support	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.	Retain Coastal Environment Policy CE-P4 [inferred].		Accept in part
FS566.1752	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S449.022	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P4	Support	Future urban/residential development needs to be compact. Sprawling residential growth outside the urban areas brings negative effects - it generates longer driving distances for basic services, climate emissions, fragments rural land, reduces the area	Retain Coastal Environment Policy CE-P4 [inferred].		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of productive land and undermines the character and amenity values of rural and coastal areas.			
FS569.1821	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1838	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
S511.094	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P5	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.094	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1665	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1679	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1701	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S364.066	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P5	Support in part	The coastal environment has value in of itself, not just in characteristics and qualities and the wording of the proposed policies should reflect this.	Amend Policy CE-P5 as follows: b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the ~~characteristics and qualities~~ coastal environment		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS548.119	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1147	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.206	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1161	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1183	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S431.029	John Andrew Riddell	CE-P5	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Amend Policy CE-P5, to replace 'Enable' with 'Provide for' and amend point b. to identify what characteristics and qualities are not be compromised		Accept in part
FS332.029	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.029	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G generally supports the relief as improving the completeness and readability of the CE provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.113	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P5	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.			
FS346.724	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
S386.011	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-P6	Support	Ballantyne & Agnew generally support the recognition of farming activities within the coastal environment, and that they contribute to the established values of these environments	Retain as notified.		Accept in part
S222.062	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P6	Support	The policy seeks to enable farming activities in the coastal environment and that part of the policy is supported. The qualifications that farming is only supported where "its use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities", are unnecessary. Farming is a typical activity in the coastal environment in the Far North, and as recognised by the Proposed Plan, in many instances it defines its character. The qualifications proposed in the policy are better managed by other overlays that are targeted to the management of specific resources (for example indigenous vegetation clearance in the High and Outstanding Natural Character overlay).	Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: Enable farming activities within the coastal environment ~~where:~~ ~~a. the use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment;~~ ~~or b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities.~~		Accept in part
S167.070	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P6	Support in part	The qualifications that farming is only supported where "its use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities", are unnecessary. The qualifications proposed in the policy are better managed by other overlays that are targeted to the management of specific resources.	Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: Enable farming activities within the coastal environment ~~where:~~ ~~a. the use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment;~~ ~~or b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities.~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.23	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The submitter agrees with the submission that the qualifications in this policy as drafted that farming is only supported where "its use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities", are unnecessary and do not recognise the existence of farming activities in the coastal environment.	Allow		Accept in part
FS548.059	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Existing, lawfully established activities should be able to continue within the coastal environment as long as they do not increase any potential adverse effects on that environment.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS566.432	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S421.184	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-P6	Oppose	Federated Farmers does not support policy CE-P6 as it is currently drafted. The policy has been written in such a way that it is implied that only existing farming activities can occur within the coastal environment. The scope of the policy needs to be broader to allow for new farming activities to occur within the coastal environments as well. Farmers needs to have the ability to diversify and change their farming operations into new areas that still fall under the concept of farming.	Amend Policy CE-P6 so that it specifically provides for new and existing farming activities to occur in the coastal environment as a right		Accept in part
FS143.65	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the submitter that Farmers need to have the ability to diversify and change their farming operations into new areas that still fall under the concept of farming, and that the policy as written would significant limit that.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.138	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1416	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.418	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1430	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1452	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S159.072	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-P6	Support in part	The use should be consistent with the surrounding land use - not just characteristics and qualities.	Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: Enable farming activities within the coastal environment where: 1. the use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or 2. the use is consistent with surrounding land use , and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities.		Accept in part
FS151.240	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.234	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.248	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.270	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S463.055	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-P6	Oppose	It is unclear how sub-clause (a) could be operationalised in a resource consent application context. Sub-clause (b) appears to be incomplete. Nevertheless, WBF observes that the requirement to be "consistent with, and does not compromise" is indicative of a de-facto requirement to avoid farming activities if these are deemed to "compromise" the unspecified "characteristics and	Delete Policy CE-P6 OR amend to clearly enable farming in the coastal environment in line with Rule CE-R4.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				qualities". Furthermore, this policy appears more tentative than Rule CE-R4, which permits farming in the coastal environment as long as it is done outside HNC or ONC areas.			
FS405.063	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the submission point to delete the policy, although they generally support the recognition of farming activities within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part	disallow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S364.067	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P6	Support in part	The coastal environment has value in of itself, not just in characteristics and qualities and the wording of the proposed policies should reflect this.	Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities coastal environment		Accept in part
FS548.120	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1148	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.207	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1162	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1184	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S431.030	John Andrew Riddell	CE-P6	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other	Amend Policy CE-P6, to replace 'Enable' with 'Provide for' and amend point b. to identify what characteristics and qualities are not be compromised		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.			
FS332.030	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.030	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G generally supports the relief as improving the completeness and readability of the CE provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S451.014	Pacific Eco-Logic	CE-P6	Support in part	Contrary to Appendix 1, farming (pastoral agriculture) was not used as a value when mapping areas of at least high natural character for the RPS. Depending on how Policy CE-P6 is interpreted, farming use can be relevant if that includes protecting indigenous plants and animals.	Amend Policy CE-P6 to clarify: 1. What is included in the definition of farming 2. Recognise that farming has and can continue to have adverse effects on the coastal natural character of the Far North.		Accept in part
FS332.201	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1519	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1533	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1555	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S243.088	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P6	Support in part	The policy seeks to enable farming activities in the coastal environment and that part of the policy is supported. The qualifications that farming is only supported where "its use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities", are unnecessary.	Amend Policy CE-P6 as follows: Enable farming activities within the coastal environment where: ~~a. the use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment;~~ ~~or b. the use is consistent with, and does~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Farming is a typical activity in the coastal environment in the Far North, and as recognised by the Proposed Plan, in many instances it defines its character. The qualifications proposed in the policy are better managed by other overlays that are targeted to the management of specific resources (for example indigenous vegetation clearance in the High and Outstanding Natural Character overlay).	~~not compromise the characteristics and qualities.~~		
FS570.646	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.660	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.682	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S148.032	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	CE-P6	Not Stated	The chapter on the Coastal Environment fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. While the notes to this chapter refer to the Plan's ability to establish more stringent rules that the NES-PF, no justification for this has been provided in the section 32 report and, doing so, would fail to meet the wider policies and objectives of the Plan for example PRROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04, and RPROZ-P1. Policy CE-P6 seeks to grandparent an existing land use that may be or could become unsustainable both in terms of economic and environmental effects. The Plan should allow for all primary production activities subject to managing any adverse effects.	Amend CE-P6 to read " Provide for primary production activities within the coastal environment where: a. the use forms part of the values that established natural character of the coastal environment; or b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities."		Reject
FS346.538	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.			
FS566.144	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
S160.025	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	CE-P6	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to policy CE-P6 because it includes only one of the primary production sector which is not fair or equitable. Large tracts of forestry are already in the coastal environment, largely planted to prevent erosion to the coastal sand dunes. Plantation forestry is a valuable tool in the coastal environment to prevent ongoing erosion.	Amend policy CE-P6 to include primary production		Reject
FS346.595	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
S442.158	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P6	Support in part	Contrary to Appendix 1, farming (pastoral agriculture) was not used as a value when mapping areas of at least high natural character for the RPS. Depending on how Policy CE-P6 is interpreted, farming use can be relevant if that includes protecting indigenous plants and animals.	Amend Policy CE-P6 to clarify: 1. What is included in the definition of farming 2. Recognise that farming has and can continue to have adverse effects on the coastal natural character of the Far North.		Accept in part
FS346.769	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.031	John Andrew Riddell	CE-P7	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and	Amend point b. of Policy CE-P7 by identifying what characteristics and qualities are not to be compromised.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.			
FS332.031	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.031	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G generally supports the relief as improving the completeness and readability of the CE provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S333.062	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.	Retain Policy CE-P8		Accept
S168.070	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.	Retain Policy CE-P8		Accept
S187.061	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.	Retain Policy CE-P8.		Accept
S222.063	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.	Retain Policy CE-P8		Accept
S167.071	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.	Retain Policy CE-P8		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.24	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	As noted by the submitter, the natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its restoration and enhancement to give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, as has been the case at Mataka Station.	Allow		Accept
FS566.433	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
S364.068	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P8	Support in part	To better align Policy CE-P8 with Policy 14 of the NZCPS, the Director-General requests the replacement of "enhancement" with "rehabilitation". Enhancement is referenced in the NZCPS when referring to water quality and natural defences against coastal hazards, but not for natural character.	Amend Policy CE-P8 as follows: Encourage the restoration and ~~enhancement~~ rehabilitation of the natural character of the coastal environment.		Reject
FS548.121	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1149	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.208	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1163	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1185	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S243.089	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P8	Support	The natural character of the coastal environment is in many instances significantly modified or degraded and it is appropriate that the Proposed Plan encourages its	Retain Policy CE-P8		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				restoration and enhancement to give effect to the NZCPS.			
FS570.647	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.661	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.683	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S463.056	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	Part of WBFs site is proposed to be included in the ONC80 area (151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236). WBF opposes the application of that layer to its property. For completeness, it also opposes this policy insofar as it would prohibit WBF's landscape maintenance activities and the upgrade and development of structures in the Totara Forest.	Delete ONC80 from SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character and the mapping notation shown on 151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236 OR delete Policy CE-P9.		Accept
S167.072	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept
FS143.25	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that this policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2, and as such should be deleted.	Allow		Accept
FS368.111	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
FS566.434	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
S421.185	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-P9	Oppose	Federated Farmers does not support policy CE-P9. The policy is inconsistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in that it appears to prohibit all land use and subdivision from all outstanding natural character areas located in the coastal environment. The policy as proposed is overly restrictive and does not provide for appropriate subdivision and land use to occur. It is not possible to undertake the	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sustainable management of the coastal environment if there is no framework that allows for appropriate activities with no more than minor effects to occur.			
FS143.66	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that the policy as proposed is overly restrictive and does not provide for appropriate subdivision and land use to occur. As Mataka Station has shown, it is not possible to undertake sustainable land use change in the coastal environment.	Allow		Accept
FS196.137	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept
FS401.032	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	reason contained within the Original Submission No 421.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS332.235	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject
FS368.117	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
FS570.1417	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.419	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1431	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1453	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S364.069	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-P9	Support in part	Policy CE-P9 is generally supported by the Director-General as being consistent with Policies 13 and 15 of the NZCPS; however, the coastal environment has value in of itself, not just in	Amend Policy CE-P9 as follows: Prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				characteristics and qualities and the wording should reflect this.	~~characteristics and qualities in~~ outstanding natural character areas.		
FS339.053	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	We support including specific mention of subdivision. The coastal environment's natural character should be protected, irrespective of whether it is classified as 'outstanding'.	Allow in part	Amend CE-P9 as follows: "Prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of natural character areas.	Accept in part
FS548.122	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought do not provide clarity to the policy and exactly what is meant to be focused on.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1150	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.209	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1164	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1186	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S511.095	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P9	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision		Reject
FS164.095	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes	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).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1666	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1680	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1702	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S243.090	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept
FS401.019	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS368.114	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
FS570.648	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.662	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.684	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S394.044	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust	CE-P9	Support in part	Largely support, though note that each characteristic or quality of ONL and ONF should attract protection to ensure protection on the round.	Amend Policy CE-P9 as follows: Prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of any of the		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas.		
FS401.024	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Oppose	The deletion of the word "significant" results in a policy which is undefined and would not allow any permitted activities to occur. The protection of those values sought in the new policy are already captured under the RMA and the PDP.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS363.044	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS538.044	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS537.044	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS536.044	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS535.044	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS533.044	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS532.044	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS531.044	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS530.044	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS529.044	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS528.044	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS527.044	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS526.044	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS525.044	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS524.044	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS523.044	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS522.044	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS521.044	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS520.044	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS519.044	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS518.044	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS517.044	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS516.044	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS515.044	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS514.044	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS513.044	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS512.044	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS511.044	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS510.044	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS509.044	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS508.044	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS507.044	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS506.044	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS505.044	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS504.044	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS503.044	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS502.044	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS501.044	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS500.044	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS499.044	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS498.044	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS497.044	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS496.044	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS495.044	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS494.044	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS493.044	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS492.044	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS491.044	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS490.044	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS489.044	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS487.044	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS486.044	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS485.044	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS483.044	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS482.044	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS481.044	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS480.044	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS479.044	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS478.044	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS477.044	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS476.044	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS475.044	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS474.044	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS473.044	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS472.044	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS471.044	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS470.044	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS469.044	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS468.044	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS467.044	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS466.044	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS465.044	Rangimarie Muri		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS464.044	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS463.044	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS462.044	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS461.044	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS460.044	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS459.044	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS458.044	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS457.044	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS456.044	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS455.044	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS454.044	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS453.044	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS452.044	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS451.044	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS450.044	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS447.044	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS440.044	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS439.044	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS436.044	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS435.044	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS434.044	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS433.044	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS432.044	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS431.044	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS430.044	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS429.044	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS428.044	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS427.044	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS426.044	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS425.044	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS423.044	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS422.044	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS421.044	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS420.044	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS418.044	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS417.044	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS416.044	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS415.044	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS408.044	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS388.044	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS387.044	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS386.044	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS385.044	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS382.044	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS381.044	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS380.044	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS379.044	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS378.044	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS365.044	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS360.044	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS359.044	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS358.044	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS357.044	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS356.044	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS568.044	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS567.044	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS563.044	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS562.044	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS561.044	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS560.044	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS559.044	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS558.044	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS557.044	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS556.044	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS555.044	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS553.044	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS552.044	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS551.044	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS546.044	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS545.044	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS544.044	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS178.044	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S187.062	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9.		Accept
FS368.112	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
S222.064	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept
FS368.113	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
S333.063	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-P9	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept
FS368.115	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S168.071	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-P9	Oppose	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9		Accept
FS368.116	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P9	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P9	Accept
S442.114	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P9	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.725	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
S394.044	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	CE-P9	Support in part	Largely support, though note that each characteristic or quality of ONL and ONF should attract protection to ensure protection on the round.	Amend Policy CE-P9 as follows: Prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of any of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas.		Reject
FS413.044	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S386.012	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-P10	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew support FNDC's approach to include a 'manage' policy to provide plan-users and decision-makers key matters to consider as part of a resource consent. Ballantyne & Agnew seek amendments to improve consistency and clarity. Clause (l) relates to the quality of coastal waters; this is considered to be a function of regional council and is considered inappropriate.	Amend CE-P10 as follows: "CE-P10 Manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity into the wider landscape and maintenance of any significant ridgelines; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation;~~l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and~~ m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities,including ecological enhancement and / or restoration."	
S463.059	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	Sub-clauses (a) to (m) are a list of assessment matters that are inappropriate to be included in a policy. They do not provide direction about how to	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				achieve the overarching objectives. WBF recommends deletion of the policy and reliance on the remaining policies. If necessary, the assessment criteria can be relocated to rules and standards of the infrastructure chapter.			
S451.015	Pacific Eco-Logic	CE-P10	Support in part	Policy CE-P10 does not address all the effects that need to be addressed to protect coastal natural character	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications: 7. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present 8. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the natural character values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property 9. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements 10. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control) 11. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife 12. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife 13. The level of anthropogenic sound that is likely during construction and with the ongoing new activities 14. The level of anthropogenic night lighting proposed and its potential effect on indigenous species. 15. The impact of the proposed development on the experiences of low-impact recreationists using public lands (including unformed legal roads) and the coastal marine area. 16. The impacts of construction and long-term vehicle use on natural character 17. Whether the development could hinder the ability of native ecosystems (e.g., saltmarsh) to migrate inland as sea levels rise		Accept in part
FS93.6	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	Do not agree with (12) The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions. - To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate. - To ban dogs from anywhere without first liaising with dog owners - 40% of our community - is appalling. - FNDC, this has been going on for over two decades. Please be the elected council which demands that dog control be managed via the legally appropriate means. - Controls on pet ownership should never include banning dogs, or restricting a dog owner to a certain number of dogs (one, or two, or more) at the un-researched or supported whim of the FNDC District Planning department. - FNDC chose not to restrict dog numbers by household during the consultations on the Dog Management Bylaw 2018. This was logical as the key is not numbers of dogs, but whether the owner acts responsibly towards them. Under the Dog Control Act (1996) and the Animal Management Act (1999), FNDC Animal Management Officers, the SPCA, and Police can all uplift dogs which are causing a nuisance, roaming, or being abused. The key for FNDC is to use these powers effectively, not to 'get around' the responsibility to enforce responsible dog ownership, and educate the public on what that means.			
FS88.51	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	11. Support 12. Oppose - for the same reasons as my other submissions.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS405.065	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendments which seek to add a list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications, as the points are overly conservative	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS332.202	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 submissions.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS361.056	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendments which seek to add a list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications, as the points are overly conservative	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1520	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1534	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1556	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S250.015	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-P10	Support in part	Support FNDC's approach to provide a 'manage' policy to provide plan users and decision-makers key matters to consider as part of a resource consent. Clause (l) relates to the quality of coastal waters, this is considered to be a function of regional council and is considered inappropriate.	Amend CE-P10: Manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity into the wider landscape and maintenance of any significant ridgelines ; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation; ~~l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and~~ m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities, including ecological enhancement and / or restoration.		
FS51.16	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the addition of the text in (d) as the protection of the significant ridgelines and the wider landscape within the coastal environment zone contribute to the understanding and heritage values of the region's heritage landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS393.021	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 250.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.020	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 250.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.701	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.715	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.737	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.159	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P10	Support in part	Policy CE-P10 does not address all the effects that need to be addressed to protect coastal natural character.	Insert the following to the list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications: 1. The quality and extent of the indigenous ecosystems and elements present 2. The potential impact of the proposed activity on the natural character values of the native vegetation present on, and in the vicinity of, the property 3. The type and extent of legal and practical protection being provided to protect indigenous ecosystems and elements 4. The type and scale of ecological restoration and protective management being proposed (e.g., pest control) 5. The potential hazards posed by the construction and ongoing new activities on at-risk wildlife 6. Controls on pet ownership to protect at-risk wildlife 7. The level of anthropogenic sound that is likely during construction and with the ongoing new activities 8. The level of anthropogenic night lighting proposed and its potential effect on indigenous species. 9. The impact of the proposed development on the experiences of low-impact recreationists using public lands (including unformed legal roads) and the coastal marine area. 10. The impacts of construction and long-term vehicle use on natural character 11. Whether the development could hinder the ability of native ecosystems (e.g., saltmarsh) to migrate inland as sea levels rise		Accept in part
FS405.064	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendments which seek to add a list of matters to be considered when	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications, as the points are overly conservative.			
FS361.055	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendments which seek to add a list of matters to be considered when Council assesses land use and subdivision consent applications, as the points are overly conservative	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.770	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S511.096	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-P10	Support in part	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS164.096	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1667	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1681	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1703	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S431.032	John Andrew Riddell	CE-P10	Not Stated	Not stated	Insert additional point n. to Policy CE-P10 as follows: n. any cumulative effects		Accept in part
FS332.032	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS404.032	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G generally supports the relief as improving the completeness and readability of the CE provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S167.073	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy CE-P10		Accept in part
FS368.118	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
FS566.435	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S187.063	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of	Delete Policy CE-P10.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.			
FS368.119	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
S222.065	Wendover Two Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy CE-P10		Accept in part
FS368.120	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
S243.091	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy CE-P10		Accept in part
FS368.121	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
FS570.649	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.663	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.685	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.064	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-P10	Oppose	Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Noncomplying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy CE-P10		Accept in part
FS368.122	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
S168.072	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-P10	Oppose	Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy CE-P10		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS368.123	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Delete Policy CE-P10	Allow	Delete Policy CE-P10	Accept in part
S442.115	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-P10	Support	Forest & Bird considers that the term "development" must also be specified in the provisions which refer to 'land use and subdivision'. "Development is specifically referred to in the NZCPS.	Insert "development," in front of land use and subdivision.		Reject
FS346.726	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
S82.011	Good Journey Limited	Rules	Oppose	The rules of the Coastal Environment Overlay are not supported by appropriate analysis, do not meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and do not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991. The rules within the Coastal Environment overlay do not recognise different attributes and apply a generic set of rules that are unwarranted in an urban environment. The nett effect of the coastal environment overlay provisions is that all newly built form or extensions within an urban zoned area (which contains both residential and mixed use development zones) will trigger full discretionary resource consent for any development which exceeds one storey in height, exceeds the height of the nearest ridgeline, increases the floor area by more than 20%, is not finished in a BS5252 colour palette and has a reflectance value greater than 30%.	Delete the requirements for resource consent for building additions exceeding 20% in GFA, buildings exceeding one storey in height, reference to specific colours and reflectivity limitations in urban areas		Accept in part
S183.005	MLP LLC	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Reject
S226.005	Tryphena Trustees	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Limited, David Haythornwaite			exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	
S227.005	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S228.005	Jayesh Govind and Others	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S229.005	Laurie Pearson	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S231.005	Ovisnegra Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S232.005	Tobias Groser	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S233.005	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S234.005	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S235.005	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S236.005	Connemara Black Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S237.005	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S238.005	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S239.005	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S240.005	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S241.005	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S259.022	Nicole Wooster	Rules	Support in part	A portion of the access to our property is via a peice of legal road, which has never been maintained by the council since it was formed in the 1930s as it is the end of the road and is only used by us. We are not covered by the road designation as the requiring authority doesn't look after it. However, if we needed to upgrade it to provide better access or to get a larger vehicle in we would need to get a resource consent even though it's an existing road.	Amend rules to provide for road upgrades as a permitted activity (inferred from submission), or alter the location of the coastal environment mapping to not include the road (also see S259.023)	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S352.005	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S333.066	P S Yates Family Trust	Rules	Not Stated	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness	Insert new rule as follows: "New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000" Specify the activity status as controlled activity Include the following matter of control: 1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Include the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage. A similar provision is in the Operative Whangarei District Plan 2022		
S458.003	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	Rules	Support in part	The activity status in the Coastal Environment where there is a non-compliance with the GFA for a newbuilding is not currently stated in the plan unless it is located in a more sensitive (high natural character area or outstanding natural character area). The subject site is not within either of these, and as such there is a current gap in the rule framework. Where a non-compliance with the GFA of an addition/alteration occurs, resource consent appears to be required as a Discretionary Activity under CE-R1. This is considered unnecessary for buildings that are provided for within the underlying zone and not located within a more sensitive area. It is considered that this should be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amend to provide for the non-compliance with gross floor area of a new building in the Coastal Environment as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, noting that there is currently no consenting pathway provided in the Proposed District Plan for this non-compliance.	Accept in part
S168.074	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Rules	Oppose	There is no need not to be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary	Insert new rule as follows: " New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000 " Specify the activity status as controlled activity	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. As drafted in rule CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	Insert the following matter of control:1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Insert the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S187.065	The Shooting Box Limited	Rules	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: there is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance; repair and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay; repairs and maintenance not listed will fall into discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes; CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided	Amend to add new rule as follows: "New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000" Specify the activity status as controlled activity Include the following matter of control: 1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Include the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				by subdivision; default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform; controlled activity is an appropriate activity class - Council will have already assessed appropriateness in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices; non-notification is appropriate as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S422.005	Maurice Dabbah	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S423.005	Bernard Sabrier	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S536.006	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	Rules	Oppose	Now all activities are discretionary and not permitted. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Amend the rules to allow activities (inferred)	Accept in part
S345.007	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Rules	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis.	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	
S330.003	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Rules	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rules in the Coastal Environment (inferred), however the PDP approach does not appropriately justify the provisions as no specific locality assessments have been undertaken to suggest that they are appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend rules in the Coastal Environment (inferred) to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.	Accept in part
S222.067	Wendover Two Limited	Rules	Support	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness	Add new rule as follows: "New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000" Specify the activity status as controlled activity Insert the following matter of control: 2. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Insert the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage. A similar provision is in the Operative Whangarei District Plan 2022		
S434.005	Francois Dotta	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S435.005	Elka Gouzer	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Reject
S363.035	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Rules	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 not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.			
S516.083	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	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 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.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		Reject
S359.031	Northland Regional Council	Rules	Support in part	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules in the Coastal Environment as new fencing requires resource consent.	Amend the rules to expand the permitted activity rule to allow for fencing within natural character areas, ONLs and ONFs where fencing is required for protection or enhancement of soil conservation treatments, water bodies and wetlands and in line with the Stock Exclusion Regulations and/or regional plan rules.		Accept
FS44.51	Northland Planning & Development 2020 Ltd		Support in part	Agree that allowance should be made for fencing for the reasons detailed in the submission and more.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS446.023	Omata Estate		Support in part	The rules should be further expanded to protect existing legitimate land use activities and to enable ongoing maintenance and replacement etc of existing rural land use structures such as fences and accessory buildings.	Allow in part	Amend the rules to expand the permitted activity rule to allow for fencing within natural character areas, ONLs and ONFs where fencing is required for protection or enhancement of soil conservation treatments, water bodies and wetlands and in line with the Stock	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						Exclusion Regulations and/or regional plan rules.	
FS547.028	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the change sought and seeks that the Proposed District Plan provisions enable fencing within the HNC, ONL and ONF areas as a permitted activity regardless of the use given that fencing is a common feature and serves a functional purpose within both urban and rural environments	Allow	Amend	Accept
FS534.044	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	Agree with the reasons given by NRC as to unintended consequences	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS570.1067	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.492	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB.Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1081	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1103	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S167.075	Bentzen Farm Limited	Rules	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. As drafted in rule CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided	Insert new rule as follows: "New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000" Specify the activity status as controlled activity Include the following matter of		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	control:2. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Include the following clause:Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.28	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The new rule sought by this submission point provides for the fact that there are titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. This should be allowed as a permitted activity in the case of Mataka however to enable residential activity and buildings where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site locations.	Allow in part		Reject
FS393.017	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS401.014	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.437	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
S442.162	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Isolated mature kowhai, puriri and pohutukawa trees in the coastal environment may not be adequately protected in the district plan as some	Insert a rule that requires consent to fell or significantly prune isolated mature indigenous trees such as pohutukawa within the coastal		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				patches did not meet the Northland Regional Council minimum mapping unit size and so were not included within an area of high or outstanding natural character.	environment Or Expand Schedule 1 - Schedule of Notable trees to include all these trees.		
FS67.88	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule lacks precision, is uncertain as to applicability (referring to 'mature trees') and will not effectively nor efficiently implement any objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.87	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The proposed rule lacks precision, is uncertain as to applicability (referring to 'mature trees') and will not effectively nor efficiently implement any objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.85	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule lacks precision, is uncertain as to applicability (referring to 'mature trees') and will not effectively nor efficiently implement any objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.157	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The proposed rule lacks precision, is uncertain as to applicability (referring to 'mature trees') and will not effectively nor efficiently implement any objectives of the Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS346.773	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
S493.007	William Goodfellow	Rules	Support in part	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous.	Amend to allow farming within the coastal environment and High Natural Character Overlay as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS68.112	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept
FS305.023	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The High Natural Character Overlay largely covers rural areas where farming activities are anticipated within the zones. Conal Dempsey understands the importance of ensuring that buildings associated	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				with farming are designed and located to manage adverse effects on areas of High Natural Character which can be assessed through the resource consent process.			
S550.001	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter, Lucklaw Farm Ltd, is concerned with the current level of vehicle usage in and around the foreshore and coastal marine area and seeks better protection of these areas through more restrictive rules on vehicle use in these areas. Under Rule C.1.5.1. (vehicles on beaches) of the proposed Northland Regional Plan as notified, it is stated that "District Councils may also have bylaws that control (including prohibiting) the use of vehicles on beaches as well as dunes...compliance with Rules C.1.5.1. and C.1.5.1A does not remove the need to comply with all relevant bylaw provisions". Lucklaw Farm acknowledges that the previous Far North District Council (FNDC) bylaw on vehicles on beaches (Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015) was automatically revoked in 2022 by operation of s160A of the Local Government Act 2002. Part 8 of the Road Use Bylaw 2022 now contains those rules related to vehicle use on beaches in the Far North. Under the Part 8 of the Road Use Bylaw, vehicles are only prohibited at Coopers Beach (see Schedule 6, Road Use Bylaw), and there are no beaches or parts of beaches where vehicle use is restricted (see Schedule 7, Road Use Bylaw). The Road Use Bylaw does not contain any other rules related to vehicle usage on beaches. Lucklaw Farm submits that the more detailed rules and standards regarding vehicle usage on beaches should be contained within the FNDC District Plan. Schedule 1 is an extract from the Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan, Rule DD7 which is the rule related to vehicle access on beaches. Rule DD7 operates in conjunction with Rule DD8 (also in Schedule 1) which permits vehicle use on the foreshore and seabed for emergency or law enforcement purposes	insert a comprehensive rule in the FNDC district plan which sets out standards for vehicle access on beaches and restricts use of the foreshore and seabed by vehicles except for specific purposes		Reject
FS286.1	Ross Morley		Oppose	Access points to the beaches in Northland are limited so to introduce a bylaw that only allows restricted access for services will mean high	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concentration of people (beach users) at access points. A vehicle on the beach is needed for a multitude of beach recreational activities to get gear to the water. Vehicle access on beaches should be allowed to continue HOWEVER I RECOMEND A SPEED LIMIT OF 20KM hr to ensure safety of small children (with the exception of 90 mile beach due to it's length and current use)			
FS98.1	Michael Morse		Oppose	The beach is extremely important both recreationally and for the purposes of collecting kaimoana and restriction of beach access would severely limit this. The prior submission has the intent of making Puwheke Beach the sole preserve of the landowner adjoining (Lucklaw Farm).	Disallow		Accept
S483.174	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Top Energy notes that most of the provisions included in the draft Plan relating to network utilities and regionally significant infrastructure have been removed, as have some provisions relating to existing power lines and other infrastructure within the coastal environment. Given that these network utilities are already present in the landscape, Top Energy seeks to ensure that they can be appropriately upgraded to meet the demands of technology, and ensure continued resilient supply to the rural coastal communities. Top Energy also notes that, given the interdependencies of Top Energy's networks, some of the lower voltage lines within these rural coastal communities meet the criteria of Regionally Significant. Currently there is no provision for minor upgrade to network utilities where compliance cannot be achieved with CER1 PER.3 and PER 4. Accordingly Top Energy seeks that a rule be added that specifically provides for upgrades to network utilities as a permitted activity. The inclusion of this rule results in better alignment with the NZCPS specifically policy 6.1.a, as well as the RPS policies 5.2.2 and 5.3.2 in particular.	Insert a new rule as follows: CE-RX Upgrade of electricity network utilities Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER - 1 The upgrade of electricity network utility structures or buildings: 1. is within 5m of the existing alignment location of the original structure or building; 3. does not increase the gross floor area by more than 30 percent in a 10-year period if it is a building; 4. complies with the zones permitted setback standards if it is a building; 5. does not result in pole or tower height that exceeds 25m above ground level; 6. does not result in more than two additional poles; 7. does not result in additional towers; 8. any additional cross arms do not exceed a length of more than 4m.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.220	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS346.085	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are not standards associated with that rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.225	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S179.070	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain rules		Accept in part
FS51.102	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's coastal environs.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.032	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Support to the extent consistent with our primary submission. Agree consideration needs to be given to how such overlays apply or are integrated into urban zones.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S344.018	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The default to discretionary activity for all activities within the HNCA is onerous and potential effects can be appropriately managed through a restricted discretionary activity status, with targeted matters of discretion, as opposed to a blanket discretionary status.	Amend rules to default to restricted discretionary activity inside the high natural character area.		Accept in part
FS446.021	Omata Estate		Support	Support subject to appropriate wording. Restricted Discretionary activity status is supported with clear	Allow in part	Amend rules to default to restricted discretionary activity	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and directive matters of discretion and related assessment criteria.		inside the high natural character area.	
FS547.026	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter has an interest in the decision sought, including any amendments to the provisions relating to high natural character areas required to address the decision sought. The submitter seeks that the objective and policy framework provide clearer direction in relation to managing adverse effects of activities within high natural character areas. The current provisions place a heavy emphasis on outstanding natural landscapes and features.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.022	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Restricted Discretionary activity status is supported with clear and directive matters of discretion and related assessment criteria (inferred)	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to drafting (inferred).	Accept in part
FS396.039	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S344.043	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Rules	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 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.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS446.022	Omata Estate		Support	Support subject to appropriate wording. The default approach in the Plan needs to be clear and consistent.	Allow	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters	Reject
FS547.027	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter is interested in the outcome of this decision sought.	Not stated	Amend	Reject
FS396.064	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S29.005	Bayswater Inn Ltd	Rules	Oppose	Coastal Environment Overlay - With regard to the inclusion of 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, in the coastal environment overlay, the PDP has introduced new rules which have an impact on the subdivision status, along with the future development of the sites. The creation of lots in the coastal environment would in terms of subdivision be assessed as a Discretionary Activity, whereas it is currently a Controlled Activity. Some of the restrictions on future development are illogical and unreasonable	Amend the coastal environment provisions to exempt existing/established urban areas (including 40 Marsden Road, Paihia) from the restrictions on future development including: • maximum floor area of 300 m² • maximum extension of 20% • limits on excavation and filling • maximum height of 5 metres • additional controls on indigenous vegetation removal • subdivision as a discretionary activity		Accept in part
FS400.026	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S494.007	Ian Jepson	Rules	Support in part	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to allow farming within the coastal environment and High Natural Character Overlay as a permitted activity.		Reject
FS401.038	Carrington Estate Jade LP		Support	The reason contained within the Original Submission No 494. Part of	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	and Carrington Farms Jade LP			the Further Submitters land is within the coastal environment and this is farmed			
S565.004	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Rules	Support in part	The report provided by Melean Absolum Limited, that supports the Coastal Environment s32 Report prepared by Council, only suggests potential rules for the Coastal Environment within an urban area. There is no detailed evidence provided within either report to support these 'suggestions'. The PDP includes to rules such as a 5m height limit, 300m2 building / floor area coverage, and 400m2 indigenous vegetation and earthworks limits within an urban area. There is limited rationale as to why and how these provisions were selected. it is not clear why 5m was selected, or why this height limit is appropriate. No specific locality assessments have been undertaken specifically to suggest that this is appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend the rules within the Coastal Environment to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.		Accept in part
FS547.025	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought to amend the Proposed District Plan provisions to better facilitate development within existing coastal towns. Paihia is a developed area, and therefore the residential zoned areas within the wider Paihia settlement comprise a less sensitive environment than other coastal areas. This should be reflected in the objective and policy framework and rule provisions.	Allow		Accept in part
FS348.220	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S451.018	Pacific Eco-Logic	Rules	Not Stated	Isolated mature kowhai, puriri and pohutukawa trees in the coastal environment may not be adequately protected in the district plan as some patches did not meet the Northland Regional Council minimum mapping unit size and so were not included within an area of high or outstanding natural character	Insert a rule that requires consent to fell or significantly prune isolated mature indigenous trees such as pohutukawa within the coastal environment OR Expand Schedule 1 - Schedule of Notable trees to include all these trees		Reject
FS332.205	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1523	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1537	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1559	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S243.093	Matauri Trustee Limited	Rules	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule CE-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas and are within an ONL/ONF, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected.	Insert new rule as follows:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000 Specify the activity status as controlled activity Include the following matter of control:1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Include the following clause:Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.			
FS570.651	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.665	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.687	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S148.034	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	The chapter on the Coastal Environment fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. While the notes to this chapter refer to the Plan's ability to establish more stringent rules that the NES-PF, no justification for this has been provided in the section 32 report and, doing so, would fail to meet the wider policies and objectives of the Plan for example PROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04, and RPROZ-P1.	Amend rules to provide for existing Plantation Forestry and Plantation Forestry Activities in the coastal environment as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.540	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.146	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S91.015	PF Olsen Limited	Rules	Oppose	There is no justification to require plantation forestry earthworks to comply with more stringent standards for earthworks in the Coastal Environment overlay, and for those standards to also not equally apply to other primary production land use. Rules in the Coastal Environment overlay are already in the plan for plantation forestry activities in these overlays. Plantation forestry activities include earthworks. Earthworks are undertaken in the main to provide access and infrastructure. The proposed standards might be applicable to land recontouring activities but not earthworks for plantation forestry. The drafting provides a legal nonsense in that replanting plantation forest is a discretionary activity (under rules NFL-R5 and CE-R6) but is required for the earthworks to be permitted under this standard and rule EW-R7. The earthworks Matters of Discretion go well beyond the scope of the District Council's powers under section 31 of the Resource Management Act.	Amend the rules for plantation forestry activities in the Coastal Environment overlay limiting to only apply to plantation forestry earthworks. Delete the irrelevant Matters of Discretion for earthworks in natural character areas of the Coastal Environment overlay. Amend the rules to provide consistency of application for primary production activities.		Accept in part
FS566.104	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S230.005	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)			
FS566.564	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
S585.001	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter, Lucklaw Farm Ltd, is concerned with the current level of vehicle usage at beach and dune areas in the Far North (including in and around the foreshore and coastal marine area) and seeks better protection of these areas through more restrictive rules on vehicle use in these areas. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 ('NZCPS') is to be applied as required by persons exercising functions and powers under the Resource Management Act 1991. District Plans must give effect to the NZCPS (s75(3)(b), RMA). Policy 20 of the NZCPS relates specifically to the use of vehicles on beaches and provides that those exercising powers under the RMA "control use of vehicles, apart from emergency vehicles, on beaches, foreshore, seabed and adjacent public land where...(a) damage to dune or other geological systems and processes; (b) harm to ecological systems or to indigenous flora and fauna, for example marine mammal and bird habitats or breeding area and shellfish beds..." Under Rule C.1.5.1. (vehicles on beaches) of the proposed Northland Regional Plan as notified, it is stated that "District Councils may also have bylaws that control (including prohibiting) the use of vehicles on beaches as well as dunes...compliance with Rules C.1.5.1. and C.1.5.1A does not remove the need to comply with all relevant bylaw provisions". Lucklaw Farm acknowledges that the previous Far North District Council (FNDC) bylaw on vehicles on beaches (Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015) was automatically revoked in 2022 by operation of s160A of the Local Government Act 2002. Part 8 of the Road Use Bylaw 2022 now contains those rules related to vehicle use on beaches in the Far North. Under the Part 8 of the Road Use Bylaw, vehicles are only prohibited at Coopers Beach (see Schedule 6, Road Use Bylaw), and there are no beaches or parts of beaches where vehicle use is	Insert a comprehensive rule in the FNDC district plan which sets out standards for vehicle access on beaches and restricts use of beaches (including sand dunes, the foreshore and seabed area) by vehicles except for specific purposes, in order to preserve the natural character and biodiversity of beaches in the Far North. Rules are sought to similar effect as Schedule 1 (an extract from Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan, Rule DD7 vehicle access on beaches), but in addition the rule for the Far North would apply to the entirety of the beach area including that area of beach above the mean high-water springs and including the sand dunes. Suggested rule wording is provided in attachment provided with Submission 585.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				restricted (see Schedule 7, Road Use Bylaw). The Road Use Bylaw does not contain any other rules related to vehicle usage on beaches. Lucklaw Farm submits that the more detailed rules and standards regarding vehicle usage on beaches should be contained within the FNDC District Plan. Schedule 1 is an extract from the Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan, Rule DD7 which is the rule related to vehicle access on beaches.			
FS576.001	New Zealand Defence Force		Oppose	NZDF considers that the Proposed District Plan as notified contains numerous provisions that are designed to provide for the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (s6(a) of the RMA), the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (s6(b)) and the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (s6(c)), without the addition of extra rules as suggested by the submitter. Rules as suggested by the submitter would also be ultra vires where they relate to the area below Mean high Water Springs, which is the function of the Northland Regional Council. The Proposed Northland Regional Plan February 2024 which has had all appeals resolved and so is to be treated as operative already contains provisions concerning the use of vehicles on the foreshore or seabed, for example: C.1.5.1 Conditional use of vehicles on the foreshore or seabed - permitted activity. District Councils may also make bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 that control (including prohibiting) the use of vehicles on beaches as well as dunes. This may be another option available to the Council. NZDF must undertake training in order to fulfil its statutory obligations under the Defence Act. Temporary Military Training Activity (TMTA) can include a wide variety of activities, for example water purification training, driver training in off-road environments and search and rescue training. This training is carried out in a range of environments with no or minimal adverse effects. In addition, NZDF is often involved in emergency service	Disallow	Amend	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity (e.g. firefighting, search and rescue operations and provision of potable water, including following floods, cyclones and other natural disasters). These activities are by their nature temporary, and many have effects similar to other day-to-day activities. It is possible that TMTA and emergency response activities could be carried out in the Far North District coastal environment. If the submitter's relief is accepted, then for the above reasons NZDF requests an exemption for Defence Force vehicles and activities from any such rules and restrictions.			
FS577.004	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Support	The submitter has sought the restriction of vehicles for the preservation of the natural character and biodiversity of beaches (sand dune, foreshore, and seabed areas) in the Far North. HNZPT supports the submission point as restricting vehicles would by default also protect areas of known and unknown archaeology within these beach areas.	Allow	Insert	Reject
FS578.001	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	A rule in the District Plan as sought is neither an efficient nor effective way to manage vehicles on beaches. There are circumstances where vehicle access to beaches is appropriate and necessary including access to property, launching and retrieving boats, farm maintenance and conservation purposes, and other situations where it is inappropriate, including for biodiversity, to manage sites of significance to tangata whenua and to maintain amenity values. These may involve very localised or temporary/seasonal closures, with restrictions different according to the specific location. A District Plan rule is a blunt mechanism which cannot take into account these full range of circumstances, potentially triggering many resource consents. It would also have very inefficient enforcement mechanisms. Accepting the limitations of the previous Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015 and Road Use Bylaw 2022 stated in the submission, bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Land Transport Act 1998 still provide a better mechanism to manage the issue - providing for greater specificity according to the particular circumstance, easier and more rapid	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				enforcement and fines and simpler statutory mechanisms to amend.			
FS579.001	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	A rule in the District Plan as sought is neither an efficient nor effective way to manage vehicles on beaches. There are circumstances where vehicle access to beaches is appropriate and necessary including access to property, launching and retrieving boats, farm maintenance and conservation purposes, and other situations where it is inappropriate, including for biodiversity, to manage sites of significance to tangata whenua and to maintain amenity values. These may involve very localised or temporary/seasonal closures, with restrictions different according to the specific location. A District Plan rule is a blunt mechanism which cannot take into account these full range of circumstances, potentially triggering many resource consents. It would also have very inefficient enforcement mechanisms. Accepting the limitations of the previous Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015 and Road Use Bylaw 2022 stated in the submission, bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Land Transport Act 1998 still provide a better mechanism to manage the issue - providing for greater specificity according to the particular circumstance, easier and more rapid enforcement and fines and simpler statutory mechanisms to amend.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS580.001	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	A rule in the District Plan as sought is neither an efficient nor effective way to manage vehicles on beaches. There are circumstances where vehicle access to beaches is appropriate and necessary including access to property, launching and retrieving boats, farm maintenance and conservation purposes, and other situations where it is inappropriate, including for biodiversity, to manage sites of significance to tangata whenua and to maintain amenity values. These may involve very localised or temporary/seasonal closures, with restrictions different according to the specific location. A District Plan rule is a blunt mechanism which cannot take into account these full range of circumstances, potentially triggering many resource consents. It would also have very inefficient enforcement mechanisms. Accepting the limitations	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the previous Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015 and Road Use Bylaw 2022 stated in the submission, bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Land Transport Act 1998 still provide a better mechanism to manage the issue - providing for greater specificity according to the particular circumstance, easier and more rapid enforcement and fines and simpler statutory mechanisms to amend.			
FS581.001	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	A rule in the District Plan as sought is neither an efficient nor effective way to manage vehicles on beaches. There are circumstances where vehicle access to beaches is appropriate and necessary including access to property, launching and retrieving boats, farm maintenance and conservation purposes, and other situations where it is inappropriate, including for biodiversity, to manage sites of significance to tangata whenua and to maintain amenity values. These may involve very localised or temporary/seasonal closures, with restrictions different according to the specific location. A District Plan rule is a blunt mechanism which cannot take into account these full range of circumstances, potentially triggering many resource consents. It would also have very inefficient enforcement mechanisms. Accepting the limitations of the previous Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015 and Road Use Bylaw 2022 stated in the submission, bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Land Transport Act 1998 still provide a better mechanism to manage the issue - providing for greater specificity according to the particular circumstance, easier and more rapid enforcement and fines and simpler statutory mechanisms to amend.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS582.001	Matauri Trustee Limited		Oppose	A rule in the District Plan as sought is neither an efficient nor effective way to manage vehicles on beaches. There are circumstances where vehicle access to beaches is appropriate and necessary including access to property, launching and retrieving boats, farm maintenance and conservation purposes, and other situations where it is inappropriate, including for biodiversity, to manage sites of significance to tangata whenua and to maintain amenity values. These may involve	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				very localised or temporary/seasonal closures, with restrictions different according to the specific location. A District Plan rule is a blunt mechanism which cannot take into account these full range of circumstances, potentially triggering many resource consents. It would also have very inefficient enforcement mechanisms. Accepting the limitations of the previous Vehicles on Beaches Bylaw 2015 and Road Use Bylaw 2022 stated in the submission, bylaws under the Local Government Act 2002 or the Land Transport Act 1998 still provide a better mechanism to manage the issue - providing for greater specificity according to the particular circumstance, easier and more rapid enforcement and fines and simpler statutory mechanisms to amend.			
S442.116	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Notes	Support in part	For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule CE-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter. There may be further significant indigenous biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Amend The Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters earthworks indigenous vegetation rules , the most stringent rule will apply.		Accept
FS85.27	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	PF Olsen opposes the inclusion of Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity as the rules related to Earthworks. The rationale for the Chapter related to the Coastal environment differs for Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity, and it cannot be transferred to one without a proper s 32 analysis.	Disallow		Reject
FS346.727	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S511.097	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Notes	Support in part	For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule CE-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter. There may be further significant indigenous biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with Policy 11 of the NZCPS	Amend The Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters earthworks indigenous vegetation rules , the most stringent rule will apply.		Accept
FS164.097	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS570.1668	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1682	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1704	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S344.032	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate	Notes	Support	The MUZ appears to have an unusual mix of activities permitted, with an onerous default to discretionary activity status. Due to the complicated nature of the commercial activities rules and the	Amend to clarify the relationship between the zone and overlay rules.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd			lack of definitions we are unable to confirm what activities would be permitted onsite. Both the MUZ and CE state that any activity not specifically provided for requires consent for a discretionary activity.			
FS396.053	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S217.025	New Zealand Defence Force	CE-R1	Support in part	TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings. Due to their temporary nature it is appropriate that any buildings or structures ancillary to temporary military training activities are permitted.	Amend Rule CE-R1 as follows: PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit) or temporary military training activities. 2. no greater than 25m2. 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-4 Except where it is ancillary to a temporary military training activity, the building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials.		Reject
S259.012	Nicole Wooster	CE-R1	Support in part	A family cemetery is located in the coastal environment. It is unclear if headstones etc would be captured by rule CE-R1 as they would be considered to be structures fixed to the land as is any concrete area associated with the grave. Unsure if this would however be covered by	Amend rules to provide for the continued operation of existing cemeteries in a coastal environment or have Council confirm that this is covered by existing use rights.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				existing use rights and therefore not need to be covered by a rule.		
S248.003	Richard G A Palmer	CE-R1	Support in part	I simply cannot see the logic where my neighbour on a 1000m2 site can build a 200m2 house right but no a 25000m2 site i need a RC for a 110m2 house	amend CE-R1 size limit to 150m2 - being a modest house	Accept in part
S368.037	Far North District Council	CE-R1	Support in part	Spelling error in PER-2. Replace 'then' with 'than'	Amend CE-R1 PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. no greater ~~than then~~ 25m2 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas.	Accept
S414.001	Peter Malcolm	CE-R1	Support in part	A large proportion of the land in the proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone in Inlet Road is designated as Coastal (Map 84). In proposed coastal environment (CE-R1) new buildings. New buildings less than 300m2 are permitted in an urban zone but not in other zones, in particular rural lifestyle.	Amend CE-R1(PER-1) to: "If new building is located in an urban zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m2 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas."	Reject
S363.014	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	CE-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that rule CE-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, places unnecessarily restrictive rules upon urban areas such as Paihia within the CE where amenity and character has already been compromised.	Amend rule CE-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, to exclude land zoned MUZ, RSZ and LIZ or any equivalent commercial zone, to enable development to occur in accordance with the underlying zone provisions.	Accept in part
S463.060	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The upshot of this rule for WBF is that in the coastal environment, a discretionary activity status applies to all development > 25 m². Even if smaller than 25 m², development is a discretionary activity if it is not ancillary to farming. At Kauri Cliffs the land in both the coastal	Amend PER-2 of Rule CE-R1 to include new point 4. as follows: 4. Located in a Special Purpose Zone, where the zone provisions prevail and this rule does	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				environment and the RPROZ, is mainly cliffs or areas of regenerating vegetation. Farming is not carried out in these areas. The remaining areas of Kauri Cliffs that are in the coastal environment are in the Golf Living, Golf Playing or Lodge subzones, and accommodate limited farming activity, which will decrease further as the next stage of development is implemented. Therefore, the 25 m² and ancillary to farming performance standards are practically impossible for WBF to comply with. These standards are entirely misplaced in the context of Kauri Cliffs, given the activities that exist, or can reasonably be anticipated, in the Golf Living, Golf Playing or Lodge subzones.	not apply. Amend the reference to CE-S1 in PER-4 of Rule CE-R1 as follows:CE-S1 Maximum height, except in a Special Purpose Zone, where the zone provisions prevail and this rule does not apply.	
S502.016	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R1	Support in part	PER-2 relates to all rural zones, including Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Residential and Settlement, as well as the Sport and Active Recreation zone. The Coastal Environment covers the entirety of the Waitangi Estate. It is considered that provision should be made for buildings which are not ancillary to farming, as PER-2 relates to smaller density rural zones, which do not consist of rural productive activities, such as farming. It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m² and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages associated with sport and recreation activities. This generally aligns with the Melean Absolum Limited Landscape Report as buildings which are of such a small size will generally be ancillary to a principal activity such as a sleepout or be of such a small size that the effects are easily mitigated. We note that while the Melean landscape report refers to non-habitable buildings it does not specify if these are ancillary to farming. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m² within sites not zoned urban, will meet the objectives and policies of the coastal environment by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater	Amend CE-R1 PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities and no greater than 50m2 (excluding a residential unit) or 2. a building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m2 and 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas In the event this relief is not accepted, we seek that the above changes apply to the Waitangi Estate only.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				than 50m ² . The reasoning behind this is that farm buildings less than 50m ² are generally less functional as there tends not to be sufficient space to park machinery or sufficiently store hay as an example. Offering a 25m ² restriction is unlikely to be utilized especially given that a double garage is at a minimum 36m ² . Once again, the height, colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 50m ² or less could be considered to not adversely affect the natural character of the coastal environment. This is also consistent within Policy CE-P6 which seeks to 'enable farming activities within the coastal environment.		
S503.014	Waitangi Limited	CE-R1	Not Stated	PER-2 relates to all rural zones, including Rural Production, Rural Lifestyle, Rural Residential and Settlement, as well as the Sport and Active Recreation zone. The Coastal Environment covers the entirety of the Waitangi Estate. It is considered that provision should be made for buildings which are not ancillary to farming, as PER-2 relates to smaller density rural zones, which do not consist of rural productive activities, such as farming. It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m² and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages associated with sport and recreation activities. This generally aligns with the Melean Absolum Limited Landscape Report as buildings which are of such a small size will generally be ancillary to a principal activity such as a sleepout or be of such a small size that the effects are easily mitigated. We note that while the Melean landscape report refers to non-habitable buildings it does not specify if these are ancillary to farming. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m² within sites not zoned urban, will meet the objectives and policies of the coastal environment by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater than 50m². The reasoning behind this is that farm	Amend PER-2 of Rule CE-R1 as follows: PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities and no greater than 50m² (excluding a residential unit) or 2. a building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m² and 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. In the event this relief is not accepted, we seek that the above changes apply to the Waitangi Estate only.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				buildings less than 50m ² are generally less functional as there tends not to be sufficient space to park machinery or sufficiently store hay as an example. Offering a 25m ² restriction is unlikely to be utilized especially given that a double garage is at a minimum 36m ² . Once again, the height, colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 50m ² or less could be considered to not adversely affect the natural character of the coastal environment. This is also consistent within Policy CE-P6 which seeks to 'enable farming activities within the coastal environment.			
S421.186	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-R1	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support the use of the high natural character layer and seeks its removal in its entirety. Federated Farmers supports new buildings ancillary to farming activities being permitted under rule CE-R1. We seek that the 25m ² size for these buildings be increased to a reasonable size. The proposed size is too restrictive and is not fit for purpose as ancillary farm buildings are typically greater in size as they need to be able to accommodate farm machinery, hay bales etc. The requirement for the new buildings to be located outside of outstanding natural character areas is not support as it does not recognise the functional need for farm buildings to be located where they are needed and where they are of the most use.	Amend Rule CE-R1 as follows: - Remove all references to the use and application of high character areas/layers - Amend PER-2 to increase the size from 25m² to 250m² - Amend PER-2 to delete the requirement for a new building ancillary to farming activities to be located outside of outstanding natural character area		Accept in part
FS24.26	Lynley Newport		Support	agree with sentiment expressed	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.136	Joe Carr		Support	replaces excessively restrictive provision	Allow		Accept in part
FS332.236	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Retain all references to high character areas, especially for coastal areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS354.149	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks the deletion of 'high' natural character. Outstanding natural character is provided for in the NZCPS, but there is no requirement to identify 'high' natural character. The focus should be to give effect to the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow S421.186	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1418	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.420	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1432	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1454	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S283.003	Trent Simpkin	CE-R1	Oppose	The maximum size of 300m2 is too restrictive within the urban zones. There is a large quantity of homes being designed and built that are over 300m2 and to make it mandatory to get a resource consent is just slowing the project down, especially when a home might be 305m2. In terms of a house - whether it's 200m2 or 500m2 it is actually providing a very similar visual impact because often larger homes hide the space.	Delete the 300m2 maximum floor area requirement.		Accept in part
FS45.11	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Dumb rule. Enough said.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.817	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.831	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.853	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.074	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The rule as proposed fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring in the coastal environment.	Amend rule CE-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units). As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative, added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m². 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas. PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than ~~25m²~~ 50m². 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials. Amend the activity status for non compliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary and non-complying to restricted discretionary activity in each case. Insert the following restricted discretionary activity assessment matter:The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation; l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. n. Whether locating the activity within	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert the following clause:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.27	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	As noted by the submitter, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. This should be allowed as a permitted activity in the case of Mataka to enable residential activity and buildings where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site locations.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS446.026	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support to the extent that the activity status for infringements to the permitted standards in CE-R1 should be restricted discretionary. Omata Estate considers that there should be further refinement as to the restricted discretionary matters of discretion and assessment criteria for consideration of restricted discretionary activities. Omata Estate also supports the decision sought to preclude public and limited notification for restricted discretionary activities unless there are special	Allow in part	Amend rule CE-R1	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				circumstances which warrant notification of the application.			
FS393.016	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.013	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS305.024	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS566.436	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S493.008	William Goodfellow	CE-R1	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS67.115	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.116	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS368.126	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
S287.001	Tristan Simpkin	CE-R1	Oppose	The maximum size of 300m2 is too restrictive. There is a large quantity of homes being designed and built that are over 300m2 and to make it mandatory to get a resource consent is just slowing the project down, especially when a home might be 305m2. In terms of a house - whether it's 200m2 or 500m2 it is actually providing a very similar visual impact because often larger homes hide the space.	Delete the 300m2 maximum floor area.		Accept in part
FS29.24	Trent Simpkin		Support	I support deleting the 300m2 maximum floor area. So many homes we're designing are over 300m2 and it shouldn't be about the size of the house that matters to council. you can get a 100m2 home that is visually terrible which has alot worse impact than a well designed 300m2 home. Therefore i support removing the rule altogether.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.872	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.886	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.908	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S320.009	Far North Holdings Limited	CE-R1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that amendments to rule CE-R1 New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures, are appropriate for all of the Far North Holdings Ltd (FNHL) landholdings, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Amend CE-R1 to read as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m2, except within the OMDA, and the Mixed Use Zone at the Opuia Marina, Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate, and Colenzo Triangle that is no greater than 800m2...		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS107.1	Laurell Douglas		Support	This submission supports the collective vision of the combined rail, cycle, steamboat experience in the Bay of Islands. The BOIVRT have resource consent already granted on Colenso Triangle land within the OMDA and have been working alongside the community to create a shared vision for this site. The Mixed Use Zoning will better support the community vision that includes a railway station, public carparking, bike and tourism connections, retail, art, educational and visitor facilities; a biodiversity corridor connecting Opuia to Kawakawa along the rail corridor that will provide a platform for social, cultural, economic, environmental opportunities and build on the infrastructure investment, that being Bay of Islands Vintage Railway, Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail and the number of other ideas expressed by hapu, community to develop collective impact and potential on the corridor. Comment applies to all points raised by FNHL in submission #320	Allow		Accept in part
S159.073	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R1	Oppose	There needs to be provision for buildings for rural production activities in the Coastal environment given that farming is a permitted activity.	Amend subsection 2 of PER-2 of Rule CE-R1as follows: No greater than ~~25m²~~ 100m² except for artificial crop protection structure.		Accept in part
FS151.241	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS446.024	Omata Estate		Support	Omata Estate support the decision sought to enable provision for artificial crop protection structures. The submitter operates a vineyard on the site. Artificial crop structures should be provided for as a permitted activity within the Coastal Environment. An alternative form of relief could be to amend CE-R4 to enable both farming as an activity and structures / buildings associated with farming as a permitted activity in the Coastal Environment	Allow	Amend subsection 2 of PER-2 of Rule CE-R1	Accept in part
FS346.012	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately manage effects in the coastal environment.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.235	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.249	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.271	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S159.074	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R1	Oppose	There needs to be provision for buildings for rural production activities in the Coastal environment given that farming is a permitted activity	Amend Rule CE-R1 to insert following: PER-5 Artificial crop protection structures located outside outstanding natural character areas where: • Dark green or black cloth shall be used on all vertical faces • Green or black cloth shall be used horizontally where the slope is over 10° • The structures shall be set back at least 50m from MHWS • No site coverage shall apply • The structures shall be setback 5m from the road boundary unless screened with natural shelter Activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-5 - Discretionary		Reject
FS151.242	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS446.025	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in part subject to the standards being appropriately flexible and suitable for all types of horticulture.	Allow in part	Amend Rule CE-R1	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.013	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately manage effects in the coastal environment.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.236	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.250	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.272	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S496.006	Philip Thornton	CE-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS376.1	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
FS411.006	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
FS368.129	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS377.1	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S495.009	Ricky Faesen Kloet	CE-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the coastal environment overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend CE-R1 to remove provisions restricting the area of new buildings (inferred).		Accept in part
FS376.2	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
FS410.009	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS368.128	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS377.2	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
S494.008	Ian Jepson	CE-R1	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS376.3	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.			
FS368.127	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS377.3	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
S497.006	Mark John Wyborn	CE-R1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS376.4	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
FS66.192	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on height, colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including dwellings, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
FS368.130	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS377.4	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The submission is supported noting that, subject to appropriate standards on colour and reflectivity, new buildings, including residential units, should be able to occur as a permitted activity where land is subject to the coastal environment overlay.	Allow		Accept in part
S461.002	Kingheim Limited	CE-R1	Support in part	The floor area restrictions for new buildings in the CE should be removed. The CE Chapter includes standards requiring colours and materials to be sympathetic to the surrounding environment (CE-S1). Provided these rules are complied with, any effects of such buildings will be mitigated. There is	amend CE-R1 PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is: ~~1. no greater than 300m2.~~ 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				no need to still require consent for buildings simply because they exceed a certain size.	PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: ~~1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit).~~ ~~2. no greater than 25m².~~ 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas		
FS376.5	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees that subject to appropriate standards on materials and colours, buildings, including residential units, can appropriately be located in the coastal environment outside of the outstanding natural character overlay as a permitted activity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS383.1	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees that subject to appropriate standards on materials and colours, buildings, including residential units, can appropriately be located in the coastal environment outside of the outstanding natural character overlay as a permitted activity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS384.1	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The further submitter agrees that subject to appropriate standards on materials and colours, buildings, including residential units, can appropriately be located in the coastal environment outside of the outstanding natural character overlay as a permitted activity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS377.5	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees that subject to appropriate standards on materials and colours, buildings, including residential units, can appropriately be located in the coastal environment outside of the outstanding natural character overlay as a permitted activity.	Allow		Accept in part
S243.092	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The rule as proposed fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units	Amend rule CE-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				can bring in the coastal environment. Provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units). 50m², rather than 25m², better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the coastal environment. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative, added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m². 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas. PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than ~~25m²~~ 50m². 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials. Amend the activity status for non-compliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary and non-complying to restricted discretionary activity in each case. Add the following restricted discretionary activity assessment matter:The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation; l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. n. Whether locating the activity within	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Add the following clause:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS446.027	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in part to the extent a greater height standard should be specified that enables a greater flexibility in architectural design e.g 6.5 or 7metres and any infringement should be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity	Allow in part	amend CE-S1	Accept in part
FS305.028	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.650	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.664	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.686	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S386.013	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-R1	Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew consider that the 5m height limits imposed by CE-S1 Maximum Height to all new buildings and structures within urban zones is overly restrictive. In Ballantyne & Agnew's view these areas are locations where development is already concentrated, provided for by the PDP and are supported by infrastructure. In Ballantyne & Agnew's view, the built form (like farming) does form part of the values present in these areas. The PDP encourages and seeks to consolidate development into these areas, however the limitations on building footprints and height are considered to hinder development capacity in these locations should these design controls remain in place. With respect to new buildings outside of urban zones, while it is recognised that farming forms part of the established values of natural character of the CE, Ballantyne & Agnew consider it unnecessary to limit new buildings/structures in this way, given the introduction of any new built form will be the same or similar irrespective if the building is ancillary to farming or not. Further, it is considered that CE-R1 as proposed, does not adequately provide for the variable environments that exist within the District or appropriately respond to the underlying zone framework. Finally, the default activity status of 'Discretionary Activity' resource consenting pathway for activities outside of mapped ONC and HNC areas is considered overly onerous. Targeted matters of discretion would be more appropriate to manage effects.	- Amend CE-R1-PER-1 to delete clause (1) that relates to building footprint. - Amend CE-R1-PER-2 to delete clause (1). - Review the building footprint controls proposed in clause (2) and provide for appropriate building footprints that reflect the varied values of each zone environment. - Incorporate a restricted discretionary activity to CE-R1 with targeted matters of discretion to provide for activities that cannot comply with the permitted standards and are outside of HNC and ONC areas.		Accept in part
FS446.028	Omata Estate		Support	Support subject to appropriate wording. A restricted discretionary consenting pathway is more appropriate and will facilitate targeted matters of discretion and assessment criteria for consideration of proposed activities which do not comply with the permitted standards	Allow	Amend CE-R1-PER-1 to delete clause (1) that relates to building footprint. - Amend CE-R1-PER-2 to delete clause (1).	Accept in part
FS547.031	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought as this will provide greater flexibility to landowners in terms of housing size and typography. A restricted discretionary consenting pathway is more appropriate and will facilitate targeted matters of discretion and assessment criteria for consideration of proposed	Allow	Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activities which do not comply with the permitted standards			
S251.007	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	CE-R1	Support in part	NZMPL generally support FNDCs efforts to protect the natural character of the coastal environment from inappropriate land use, subdivision and development in accordance with section 6 of the RMA, NZCPS and RPS. However, it has concerns with the bulk and scale approach taken in the PDP, particularly in relation to building height and size in urban areas. In NZMPL's view, FNDC through its Section 32 report has not adequately assessed the proposed thresholds. When considering the scale and height of existing buildings in urban areas and in the context of each zones anticipated outcomes, the notified thresholds are considered to be in conflict and do not align with the variable values of these established environments. In NZMPL's view, the urban environment thresholds for building size should be removed and managed by the underlying zone. The coverage rules already set controls to manage the bulk and scale of built form that are aligned with the character of each zone framework. While it is acknowledged that the Section 32 Report mentions building size and height to manage effects in the coastal environment, it is considered that this has not sufficiently evaluated each zone environment or taken into account the existing built form values. Finally, NZMPL are concerned with the default discretionary activity status approach taken for buildings within the CE (but are outside of high or outstanding natural character areas). It is considered that when compliance is not achieved with the relevant permitted standards, that effects can be more efficiently and effectively managed through a restricted discretionary activity that has targeted matters of discretion.	Amend PER-1 of Rule CE-R1 to remove clause(1) that relates to building footprint OR alternatively, review the thresholds for building size to align with the thresholds set by the coverage standards of the underlying zone. Insert a restricted discretionary activity to Rule CE-R1 with targeted matters of discretion to provide for activities that cannot comply with the permitted standards where the proposal is outside of HNC and ONC areas.		Accept in part
FS407.006	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported, and we concur that the analyses underpinning the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS400.012	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS396.012	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS405.066	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point as it relates to building footprint. It does not support the insertion of a restricted discretionary activity to Rule CER1 with targeted matters of discretion to provide for activities that cannot comply with the permitted standards.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.057	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the submission point as it relates to building footprint. It does not support the insertion of a restricted discretionary activity to Rule CE-R1 with targeted matters of discretion to provide for activities that cannot comply with the permitted standards.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S46.001	David King	CE-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that CE-R1/Per-2, as it applies to new buildings or structures not within an urban zone, is too prohibitive. The submitter considers that it should be a person's right to build a residential unit along with any required ancillary structure on land to which they have guaranteed title to and that the Local Authority (FNDC) sees fit to levy payable rates on that land. And, that any required earthworks to achieve that activity should also be included as being permitted.	Amend CE-R1/Per-2 to include residential units not within an urban zone and to also permit earthworks related to that activity.		Accept in part
FS393.001	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.001	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S263.032	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that rule CE-R1 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this rule as its imposition negates the overall purpose of the special zone.	Delete rule CE-R1 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.		Accept in part
FS405.067	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to clause (1) of CE-R1-PER-1 and clause (1) of CE-R1-PER-2.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS332.244	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	All of the Coastal Environment rules should apply to this highly visible site adjoining Orongo Bay.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS361.058	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to clause (1) of CE-R1-PER-1 and clause (1) of CE-R1-PER-2.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S490.005	Owen Burn	CE-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Delete the provisions of Rule CE-R1 relating to area, height and exterior finishes of new buildings in the Coastal Environment		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings			
FS405.068	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.035	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The reasons within the Original Submission No 490.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.059	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S491.005	Eric Kloet	CE-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Rule CE-R1 relating to area, height and exterior finishes of new buildings in the Coastal Environment		Accept in part
FS405.069	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.			
FS361.060	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S492.005	Ironwood Trust Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Rule CE-R1 relating to area, height and exterior finishes of new buildings in the Coastal Environment		Accept in part
FS405.070	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS361.061	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support in part	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the requested amendments as they relate to the review of the height limits, as it is not considered that the CE provides sufficient nuance or recognises the varied environments of the underlying zones.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S341.011	Ed and Inge Amsler	CE-R1	Oppose	There should be alignment between the rules where the site is urban in nature.	Amend to align with the Mixed Use Zone of 400m2 for buildings in CE-R1.		Accept in part
FS542.064	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
S344.013	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R1	Not Stated	It is considered that this rule places unnecessarily restrictive rules upon urban areas such as Paihia within the CE where amenity and character has already been compromised.	Amend CE-R1 to exclude land zoned MUZ, RSZ and LIZ or any equivalent commercial zone, to enable development to occur in accordance with the underlying zone provisions.		Accept in part
FS542.065	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
FS547.029	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought. As set out above, Paihia, including the further submitters land, is a developed area, and therefore the settlement comprises of a less sensitive environment than other coastal areas. This should be reflected in the objective and policy framework and rule provisions.	Allow		Accept in part
FS396.034	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.039	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R1	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with	Amend PER-4 of Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to new buildings or structures in an urban zone or extensions to a lawfully established building or structure.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.			
FS542.066	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
FS332.039	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S536.007	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	CE-R1	Oppose	Limiting floor area of a new building or structure located in an urban zone to 300m ² and any extension to a lawfully established building or structure to 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure has total disregard to development options and desecration of land values. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Rule CE-R1 and retain status quo (inferred)		Reject
FS547.030	Heron Point Limited		Support	Allow subject to drafting.	Allow in part	Delete Rule CE-R1 and retain status quo (inferred).	Reject
S548.003	Omata Estate	CE-R1	Oppose	The Section 32 Report on the Coastal Environment outlines that the PDP has utilised the Northland Regional Council's Regional Policy Statement mapping of the Coastal Environment and areas of High Natural Character ² . The entirety of the Omata Estate land is identified as being within the Coastal Environment and the areas of the site covered by the established native vegetation are identified as being of High Natural Character. The Coastal Environment Chapter of the PDP stipulates that a Discretionary resource consent is required to establish new buildings or structures established on sites outside of urban zones where they are not ancillary to a farming activity, are no greater than 25m ² and are outside of the Outstanding Natural Landscape (Rule CE-R1, PER-2). This activity status applies regardless of whether the new building is located outside of the High Natural Character areas. In the context of the Omata Estate land, both sites are entirely situated within the Coastal Environment. Therefore, there is no ability to locate buildings or development	amend CE-R1 to provide for the establishment of new buildings on structures outside of an urban zones (not within a high natural character area or outstanding natural character area as a restricted discretionary activity with associated matters of discretion and assessment criteria		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				outside of the Coastal Environment. The PDP should provide for new buildings and structures to be established on rural sites within the Coastal Environment through a Restricted Discretionary resource consent where it can be determined that the adverse effects of development can be appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated. This is a better outcome and more appropriate in terms of a s32 cost and benefit analysis. Omata Estate seeks that Rule CE-R1 be amended to provide for the establishment of new buildings or structures to be located outside of urban zones as a Restricted Discretionary activity where they meet the CE-S1 Maximum Height and CE-S2 Colours and Materials standards. Appropriate matters of discretion and assessment criteria would be to ensure that the adverse effects of the development on the Coastal Environment are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.			
FS332.253	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Rule CE-R1 is relevant for this coastal site.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Reject
FS368.131	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support in part	Amend CE-R1 to provide for the establishment of new buildings on structures outside of an urban zone (not within a high natural character area or outstanding natural character area) as a restricted discretionary activity with associated matters of discretion and assessment criteria	Allow in part	Amend CE-R1	Accept in part
S250.017	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-R1	Support in part	The CE does not provide sufficient nuance or recognise the varied environments of the underlying zones. This is considered relevant in both the urban and non-urban environments described in the rule, particularly as it relates to the enablement of built form that cannot meet the permitted activity thresholds described in PER-1 and PER-2 of the CE-R1. The construction of any residential unit within their site of interest would require discretionary activity resource consent, despite the site having sufficient RLZ land that has to establish as up to 21 residential units as a permitted activity in accordance with the underlying zone provisions.	Amend CE-R1-PER-1 to remove clause (1) that relates to building footprint. Amend CE-R1-PER-2 to remove clause (1). Review the building footprint controls proposed in clause (2) and provide for appropriate building footprints that reflect the varied values of each zone environment. Amend to incorporate a restricted discretionary activity to CE-R1 with targeted matters of discretion to provide for activities that cannot comply with the permitted standards where the proposal is outside of HNC and ONC areas.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				This approach is overly restrictive, when considering the nature of the effects generated. The section 32 evaluation report and supporting Landscape Report provided as Appendix 1 do not provide sufficient analysis to support this approach.			
FS332.264	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Existing controls are appropriate in this coastal area.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.703	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.717	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.739	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S168.073	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	Rule CE-R1 fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring in the coastal environment. Provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units). 50m², rather than 25m², better provides for small sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the coastal environment. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative, added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the	Amend rule CE-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 ... PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than ~~25m²~~ 50m². 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3 ... PER-4 ... Amend the activity status for non-		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	compliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary and non-complying to restricted discretionary activity in each case. Insert the following restricted discretionary activity assessment matter:The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure;b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity;e. the ability of the environment to absorb change;f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development;i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;j. the likelihood of the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					activity exacerbating natural hazards;k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation;l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.n. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert the following clause:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.025	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S187.064	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: rule fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and their benefits; provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units); 50m2, rather than m2, better	Amend Rule CE-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is:		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments; non-conformity is better dealt as a restricted discretionary activity; the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms; and except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration.	1. no greater than 300m². 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas. PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than ~~25m²~~ 50m². 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials. Amend the activity status for non compliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary and non-complying to restricted discretionary activity in each case. Add the following restricted discretionary activity assessment matter:The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation; l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; and m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. n. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					farming use.o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.Add the following clause:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.026	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S222.066	Wendover Two Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	The rule as proposed fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring in the coastal environment. Provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units). 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the coastal environment. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative, added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Except for more	Amend rule CE-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m2. 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas. PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than 25m2 50m2. 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials. Amend the activity status for non compliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from ~~discretionary and non-complying~~ to restricted discretionary activity in each case. Insert the following restricted discretionary activity assessment matter:The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure;b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity;e. the ability of the environment to absorb change;f. the need for and location of earthworks or	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					vegetation clearance;g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development;i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards;k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation;l. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andm. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.n. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert the following clause:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.027	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S333.065	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-R1	Oppose	The rule as proposed fails to recognise the existence of residential units in the coastal environment and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring in the coastal environment. Provision should be made for buildings not ancillary farming activities (including residential units). 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the coastal environment. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative, added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input. .	Amend rule CE-R1 as follows:<i>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located in an urban zone it is: 1. no greater than 300m2. 2. located outside high or outstanding natural character areas. PER-2 If a new building or structure is not located within an urban zone it is: 1. ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit). 2. If not ancillary farming activities (including a residential unit) no greater than 25m2 50m2. 3. located outside outstanding natural character areas. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or addition to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: CE-S1 Maximum height. CE-S2 Colours and materials.</i>Amend the activity status for noncompliance with PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary and non-complying to restricted discretionary		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					activity in each case. Add the following restricted discretionary activityassessment matter: <i>The effects on the characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: a. the presence or absence of buildings, structures or infrastructure; b. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; c. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; d. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; e. the ability of the environment to absorb change; f. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; g. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; h. Except as provided for under n and o below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development; i. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; j. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards; k. the opportunity to enhance public access and recreation; l. the ability to improve the overall quality of</i>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>coastal waters; and m. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. n. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use. o. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Add the following clause: New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</i>		
FS305.029	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential dwellings need to be provided for in the coastal environment.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S169.002	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R1	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R1 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Accept in part
FS368.124	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S177.002	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R1 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
FS368.125	Tokerau Beach Trust		Support	Amend Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Allow	Amend Rule	Accept in part
S483.172	Top Energy Limited	CE-R1	Oppose	No provision has been made to allow for new network utilities of an appropriate scale within these environments. CE-R1 provides limited ability for new structures within the Coastal Environment. Of concern to Top Energy are the rules that apply to sites not located within an Urban zone; outside that zone, new buildings are limited to 25m ² and only permitted where they are associated with structures that are ancillary to farming activities. No provision has been made to allow for new network utilities of an appropriate scale within this environment. Top Energy generally supports a preference to underground new customer connections in the Coastal Environment where possible, but this needs to be enabled and may require additional small scale network utility buildings and structures (e.g., transformers and pillars) above ground to facilitate this which would otherwise comply with the 25m ² and 5m height limit afforded to buildings and structures ancillary to farming. On review of the s32 analysis for the Coastal Environment chapter, it is understood that structures associated with primary production are enabled; this analysis does not expressly identify why. However, it is assumed it is because farming activities are a common fixture within this environment and that farming is a dominant primary sector industry within the District as is highlighted in the s32 Overview).	Amend Point 1 of PER-2 of Rule CE-R1 as follows: 1.ancillary to farming activities (excluding a residential unit) or a network utility.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Given that connection to electricity infrastructure is critical to such operations, Top Energy seeks that the same permitted activity threshold applies to network utilities.			
FS345.223	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S344.016	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-R1	Not Stated	It is extremely onerous to limit all buildings within an existing coastal township to be managed by strict standards and that the discretionary activity status applying to the construction of new buildings (over 300m2) within the CE but outside any ONCA can be appropriately managed through a restricted discretionary activity status, with targeted matters of discretion, as opposed to a blanket discretionary status.	Amend to provide a permitted activity tier for new buildings within an existing commercial area of a coastal township and a restricted discretionary status for proposals that do not comply (outside any ONCA). Review the relationship between MUZ and CE activity-based rules, either refined to improve clarity, or additional rules are included to ensure certain activities are clearly permitted in both areas.		Accept in part
FS396.037	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S503.015	Waitangi Limited	CE-R2	Not Stated	We are unsure whether it is the intent of the plan to cover just historic features or whether this rule seeks to extend wider to other elements which may not be historic. Regardless of this fact we seek that the following features also be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within the coastal environment and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like. The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. The Operative Plan provided for renovation and maintenance of buildings as a permitted activity, with no requirement for scale,	Amend PER-1 of Rule CE-R2 to include four additional points as follows: 8. Carparking areas 9. Board walks 10. Boat ramps 11. Buildings or structures In the event the above relief is not accepted, we seek that the changes be imposed insofar as the Waitangi Estate.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				size and materials being like for like. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved and enhanced.			
FS51.33	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with s.5(h), HNZPTA. HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a heritage overlay planning framework over the Waitangi Treaty Grounds that represents and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision is to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the management of facilities located at the Treaty Grounds.	Allow in part		Reject
FS369.465	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S167.076	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept
FS143.29	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that there is no need in the rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous	Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay.			
FS566.438	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
FS369.452	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S159.075	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R2	Support in part	Provisions should be made for structures ancillary to farming activities	Amend Rule CE-R2 to include: 8. structures ancillary to primary production activities		Reject
FS151.243	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS548.052	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The amendment sought will enable rural production activities to continue to occur without placing unnecessary barriers in front of them.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS346.014	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately manage effects in the coastal environment.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.237	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.251	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.273	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS369.451	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Accept
S421.187	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-R2	Support	Federated Farmers supports rule CE-R2 as it is drafted in the proposed district plan	Retain Rule CE-R2		Reject
FS196.135	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1419	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.421	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1433	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1455	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS369.461	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S483.173	Top Energy Limited	CE-R2	Support	Top Energy supports the repair or maintenance of network utilities as a permitted activity.	Retain Rule CE-R2		Reject
FS196.219	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject
FS345.224	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
S243.094	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.652	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.666	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.688	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S283.004	Trent Simpkin	CE-R2	Oppose	This rule can be read two ways. Is it limiting the repair or maintenance to just this list, or is it just this list of items that council is interested in? Thought needs to be given to the wording. What if submitter wants to repair letterbox, or replant roadside landscaping (just two basic examples).	Amend to express the intent of the rule more clearly (inferred)		Reject
FS570.818	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.832	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.854	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S168.075	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.453	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S169.003	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R2	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R2 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R2 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Accept in part
FS369.454	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S177.003	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R2 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R2 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
FS369.455	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S187.066	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay.	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept
FS369.456	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S222.068	Wendover Two Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the coastal environment, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.			
FS369.457	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S263.033	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	The submitter considers that rule CE-R2 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this rule.	Delete rule CE-R2 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.		Accept in part
FS369.459	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S333.067	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the coastal environment, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.	Delete Rule CE-R2		Accept
FS369.460	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S461.003	Kingheim Limited	CE-R2	Oppose	Rule CE-R2 'Repair or maintenance' is unnecessarily restrictive and should be deleted. Under the current wording, any slight changes to existing fences, roads, network utilities, driveways and access, walking tracks, cycling tracks and farming tracks will trigger the need for resource consent	delete CE-R2		Accept
FS369.462	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S463.061	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-R2	Support	It is appropriate to provide a permitted activity status for repairs or maintenance of the listed structures.	Retain Rule CE-R2.		Reject
FS369.463	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject
S502.017	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-R2	Support in part	We are unsure whether it is the intent of the plan to cover just historic features or whether this rule seeks to extend wider to other elements which may not be historic. Regardless of this fact we seek that the following features also be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within the coastal environment and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like. The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. The Operative Plan provided for renovation and maintenance of buildings as a permitted activity, with no requirement for scale, size and materials being like for like. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved and enhanced.	Amend PER-1 of Rule CE-R2 to include four additional points as follows: 8. Carparking areas 9. Board walks 10. Boat ramps 11. Buildings or structures In the event the above relief is not accepted, we seek that the changes be imposed insofar as the Waitangi Estate.		Reject
FS369.464	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S333.068	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-R3	Oppose	More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners. Where such areas are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection from inappropriate use and development. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the control. In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well-understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy CE-P10, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows:<i>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2</i> ~~Repair or maintenance.~~<i>1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like: 1. roads. 2. fences 3. network utilities 4. driveways and access 5. walking tracks 6. cycling tracks 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be</i>	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the ability of the environment to absorb change; c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>clearance; d. the operational orfunctional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited inthe particular location; e. Except as provided forunder k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity ordevelopment outside the coastal environment; f. any historical, spiritualor cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters setout in Policy TW-P6; g. the likelihood of theactivity exacerbating natural hazards; h. the ability to improvethe overall quality of coastal waters; and i. any positive contributionthe development has on the characteristics and qualities. j. Whether locating theactivity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residentialor farming use. k. Whether the location ison a previously approved building platform or access drive.</i> Insert new clause as follows:<i>Earthworksor indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist</i>	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>ornotification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</i>	
S169.004	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R3	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R3 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R3 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S168.076	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners. Where such areas are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection from inappropriate use and development. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the control. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well-understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy CE-P10, provides	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows: status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: ~~1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2~~ Repair or maintenance.1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2Except as permitted under PER-1, Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the coastal environment;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards;h. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andi. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.j. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.k. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform or access drive. Insert a new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S187.067	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: more exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for; need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard that has been adopted in the plan; non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity - CE-P10 provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition a some new matters.	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: ~~1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE R2~~ Repair or maintenance:1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Maori 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, ~~the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with~~	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effectsb. the ability of the environment to absorb changec. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearanced. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the coastal environmentf. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6g. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazardsh. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andi. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualitiesj. Whether	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.k. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform or access drive. Add new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S177.004	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R3 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R3 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S512.036	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	CE-R3	Support in part	Fire and Emergency may be required to remove vegetation in the event of an emergency or to reduce fire risk. This is enabled under Section 65 and 68 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017. The exact quantities of vegetation disturbance required cannot be determined in advance, and will be unique to the risk or emergency response required. Fire and Emergency considers that the reference to managing fire risk and so recommends similar language as in IB-R1 so that the plan aligns with the actions required by	amend CE-R3 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety or damage to property. 4. To create and/or maintain firebreaks to manage fire risk 5. for biosecurity reasons	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Fire and Emergency personnel under the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.		
S222.069	Wendover Two Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners. Where such areas are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection from inappropriate use and development. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the control. In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy CE-P10, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: ~~1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2~~ Repair or maintenance.1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				cost and risk burden on landowners.	maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from ~~discretionary~~ non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert the matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to: a. the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the coastal environment;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards;h. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andi. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.j. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use. Insert a new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S463.062	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	The result of clause PER-2 of this rule is to impose permitted limits (via standard CE-S3) on earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance of: Nil permitted in the ONC80 area that the Proposed Plan seeks to apply to the Totara Forest; 50 m² for 10 years (i.e. 5 m² per year) in a HNC area such as covers extensive areas of Kauri Cliffs coastal margin; and 400 m² for 10 years (i.e., 40 m² per year) for areas in the coastal environment but not in outstanding or high natural character areas. If these meagre permitted limits are breached, a non-complying activity status applies. It is guaranteed that WBF will need to breach these permitted limits during the term of the Proposed Plan if it is to carry out golf course maintenance, track construction and maintenance, vegetation management and infrastructure installation duties/activities that are part of its regular operations. It goes without saying that the future residential subdivision of land in the Golf Living subzone will, where it encroaches into the coastal environment, also breach these highly restrictive provisions. The consequential non-complying activity status is a highly onerous regulatory intervention that is in WBF's opinion, likely to generate ongoing resource consenting burdens. These will be of little/no benefit to the environment or the community but a significant drag on resources that could be better allocated to WBFs business and ecological restoration activities.	Amend PER-2 of Rule CE-R3 as follows: PER-2 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it:1. complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance; or2. is in the Golf Living, Golf Playing or Lodge subzones of the Kauri Cliffs zone Insert the following additional activity status for PER-2 of Rule CE-R3 as follows:Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-2 in the Kauri Cliffs Zone: Discretionary	Accept in part
S167.077	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	Farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners. Exceptions are required and the need is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan.	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:~~1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2~~	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The policy CE-P10, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters.	~~Repair or maintenance.~~ 1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like: 1. roads. 2. fences. 3. network utilities. 4. driveways and access. 5. walking tracks. 6. cycling tracks. 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2Except as permitted under PER-1, Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the coastal environment;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards;h. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andi. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.j. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.k. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform or access drive. Add new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.30	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	As is the case at Mataka Station, farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities in this rule would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS393.018	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.015	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.439	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S159.076	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R3	Support in part	Earthworks and clearance for biosecurity purposes is supported. Support providing for ancillary rural earthworks as a permitted activity to enable the ongoing productive use of land in rural environments.	Amend PER 1 of Rule CE-R3 to include: 6. The earthworks are ancillary rural earthworks		Reject
FS151.244	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS548.053	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The amendment sought will enable rural production activities to continue to occur without placing unnecessary barriers in front of them.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS346.015	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately manage effects in the coastal environment.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.238	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.252	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.274	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S421.188	Northland Federated	CE-R3	Oppose	Federated Farmers seeks the deletion of rule CE-R3. The rule contains unnecessary duplication from the zoning, earthworks and indigenous biodiversity	Delete Rule CE-R3		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand			chapters which already include provisions to appropriately manage earthworks and vegetation clearance.			
FS196.134	Joe Carr		Support in part	tautoko generally, but subject to my previous indications	Allow in part		Reject
FS401.033	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	reason contained within the Original Submission No 421.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1420	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.422	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1434	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1456	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S483.175	Top Energy Limited	CE-R3	Not Stated	Top Energy supports-R3 in particular PER-1 (2) but seeks that this be extended to provide for upgrades as provided for in the new rule sought	Amend PER 1 of Rule CE-R3 as follows (or to the same effect) to provide for earthworks and vegetation clearance associated with upgrades of infrastructure as a permitted activity. PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1.required for repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2 Repair or Maintenance-; or 2.required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines-; or 3.necessary to ensure the health and safety of the public-; or		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					f.for biosecurity reasons; or 5.for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori; or6.Required for the upgrade of network utilities where the works are permitted by CE-RX		
FS196.221	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS346.086	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are not standards associated with that rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.226	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S122.001	Lynley Newport	CE-R3	Support in part	Rule IB-R1 permits certain indigenous vegetation clearance in "All Zones", including up to 1,000m2 clearance to provide for a single residential unit, on-site services and its access, and to create or maintain a setback between a vulnerable building and vegetation. I have supported both these permitted activity clearance provisions, albeit it submitted that 1,000m2 is insufficient for dwelling, on-site servicing and access. No reference back to IB-R1 is included in CE-R3, PER-1. Given the clear intent of IB-R1, which is to recognise there are certain instances where limited indigenous vegetation clearance should be permitted, there should be a reference to this permitted activity in CE-R3, PER-1. CE-S3 is too restrictive overall. To make any indigenous clearance in an outstanding natural character area in the coastal environment a non complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire. Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non complying activity is ridiculously restrictive. I suggest a bit of re-set for CE-R3, PER-1, PER-2 and S3.	Amend CE-R3, PER-1: The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearances: 1..... through 5, then add new 6. provided for as a permitted activity in Rule IB-R1 of this Plan. PER-1 & PER-2: Amend the category of activity column such that the inability to achieve both/either PER-1 and PER-2 results in discretionary activity status.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS28.026	Dr John L Craig		Support	The submitter agrees that to make any indigenous clearance in an ONC area in the coastal environment a non-complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire. Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non-complying activity is very restrictive.	Allow	Amend CE-R3 PER-1 as follows: '6. provided for as a permitted activity in Rule IB-R1 of the plan'. Amend CE-R3 PER-2 and PER-3 so the category of activity column such that the inability to achieve both/either PER- 1 and PER-2 results in discretionary activity status.	Accept in part
FS332.224	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Vegetation clearance in coastal SNA should be non-complying to protect vulnerable landscapes.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
S511.100	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules. The standards do look more strict than the IB chapter for areas that are in a ONC, HNC and other	Delete CE-R3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules or make them even more strict		Accept in part
FS164.0100	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS548.168	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers supports the deletion of Rule CE-R3 as it contains unnecessary duplication from the zoning, earthworks and indigenous biodiversity chapters which already include provisions to appropriately manage earthworks and vegetation clearance.	Allow	Grant the relief seeking deletion of the rule.	Accept in part
FS570.1671	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1685	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1707	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S431.040	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R3	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend Rule CE-R3 so that it does not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance within an urban zone		Reject
FS332.040	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S451.016	Pacific Eco-Logic	CE-R3	Support	This rule provides reasonable protection for natural character values	Retain Rule CE-R3 Clarify that any "natural wetland" includes riparian margins		Accept in part
FS332.203	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1521	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1535	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1557	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S263.034	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	The submitter considers that rule CE-R3 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this rule.	Delete rule CE-R3 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.		Accept
FS332.245	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	All of the Coastal Environment rules should apply to this highly visible site adjoining Orongo Bay.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S364.070	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-R3	Oppose	The Director-General considers that proposed Rule CE-R3 does not adequately give effect to Policy 11 of NZCPS.	Delete Rule CE-R3. Alternatively clarify how Rule CE-R3 gives effect to Policy 11 of the NZCPS.		Accept in part
FS354.150	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the deletion of CE-R3 as it does not adequately give effect to Policy 11 of NZCPS. Policy 11 is indigenous biodiversity. CE-R3 is Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance.. Earthworks is not covered by Policy 11 so should be retained. The requirements in Policy 11 for indigenous biodiversity are not absolute so the activities provided for are to enable sustainable management.	Disallow	Disallow S364.070	Accept in part
FS570.1151	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.210	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1165	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1187	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S364.071	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	CE-R3	Oppose	The Director-General requests clarity on the inclusion of vegetation clearance for biosecurity reasons. For example, in what circumstances would an unlimited amount of indigenous vegetation be cleared as a Permitted Activity for biosecurity reasons? Can any member of the public remove indigenous vegetation for biosecurity reasons or is it only specific organisations/entities?	Amend Rule CE-R3 to clarify the inclusion of vegetation clearance for biosecurity reasons. Insert a definition for "biosecurity reasons", if appropriate. For example, limit to 'pest' and 'unwanted organism' as defined in the Biosecurity Act 1993.		Accept in part
FS354.151	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification of 'biosecurity reasons'. The HortNZ submission on IB-P7 would assist in defining 'biosecurity reasons': Provide for the active management of pest plants and pest animals including those identified in the Regional	Allow in part	Allow S364.071 to the extent that biosecurity reasons' is based in the HortNZ submission on IB-P7.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Pest Management Plan and unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.			
FS570.1152	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.211	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1166	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1188	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS369.466	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy supports R3 and seeks to ensure that it provides for upgrades of network utilities	Disallow		Accept in part
S243.095	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-R3	Oppose	More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are typically part of the coastal environment and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on landowners. Where such areas are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection from inappropriate use and development. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the control.	Amend Rule CE-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: ~~1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under CE-R2~~ Repair or maintenance: 1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like: 1. roads. 2. fences. 3. network utilities. 4. driveways and access. 5. walking tracks. 6. cycling tracks. 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy CE-P10, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					vegetation clearance is not provided for within CE-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1 and PER-2 from discretionary/non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects characteristics, values and qualities of the coastal environment, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the coastal environment;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the likelihood of the activity exacerbating natural hazards;h. the ability to improve the overall quality of coastal waters; andi. any positive contribution	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the development has on the characteristics and qualities.j. Whether locating the activity within the coastal environment is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use.k. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform or access drive. Add new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS570.653	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.667	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.689	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.119	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules. The standards do look more strict than the IB chapter for areas that are in a ONC, HNC and other	Delete CE-R3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules or make them even more strict.		Accept in part
FS346.730	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS369.467	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy supports R3 and seeks to ensure that it provides for upgrades of network utilities	Disallow		Accept in part
S442.160	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-R3	Support	This rule provides reasonable protection for natural character values.	Retain Rule CE-R3 Clarify that any "natural wetland" includes riparian margins.		Accept in part
FS346.771	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S169.005	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R4	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R4 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R4 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S253.005	IDF Developments Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	Large areas of the district's coastline are farmed and this maintains the invasion of pest and weed species in proximity to the coastline. Stewardship of the land via farming practices should be encouraged within the district plan. The proposed rule is effectively taking land away from production activities	Delete the restriction preventing farming within high or outstanding natural character areas (inferred)		Accept in part
S177.005	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R4 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R4 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S222.070	Wendover Two Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment when combined with the ONL or ONF overlay. This does not implement policy CE-P6 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in the coastal environment. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, working farms are in the coastal environment. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the coastal environment are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	Delete rule CE-R4 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative Amend rule CE-R4 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay as per the following: Activity status: Permitted ~~Where: PER-1~~ ~~The farming activity is located outside high or outstanding natural character areas.~~ ~~Activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1: Discretionary (outside an outstanding natural character area)~~ ~~Non-complying (inside an outstanding natural character area)~~ Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable	Reject
S463.063	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-R4	Support	WBF agrees that it is appropriate to require resource consent for farming activities proposed in identified HNC or ONC areas.	Retain Rule CE-R4	Accept
S167.078	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	This does not implement policy CE-P6 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in the coastal environment. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be	Delete rule CE-R4 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule CE-R4 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay. Amend rule CE-R4 as follows:	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				required for every new aspect of their operation. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning. If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above.	Activity status: PermittedWhere:PER-1The farming activity is located outside high or outstanding natural character areas.Activity status where compliance is not achieved with PER-1:Discretionary (outside an outstanding natural character area)Non-complying (inside an outstanding natural character area)Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable		
FS143.31	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that this rule does not implement policy CE-P6 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in the coastal environment. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms such as Mataka Station where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of its operation.	Allow		Reject
FS566.440	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
S421.189	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	CE-R4	Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the right of existing farm activities to occur as permitted activities within the coastal environment. We recognise that the majority of the high and outstanding natural character layers capture biodiversity and non-farming land as well as farmland. Federated Farmers wishes to ensure that any existing farming activities and farmland located in these overlays within the coastal environment are permitted to continue. It is not appropriate for the district plan not to provide for existing, lawfully established farming activities to continue in the coastal environment. It	Amend Rule CE-R4 to provide for existing farming activities and farmland as permitted activities within the coastal environment		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				is important to ensure that existing farmland is preserved and allowed to continue for future generations with a balance needing to achieve with the maintenance of the existing values formed by the coastal area.			
FS196.133	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS570.1421	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.423	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1435	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1457	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S159.077	Horticulture New Zealand	CE-R4	Oppose	Existing use rights should apply to lawfully established farming activities. Restrictions should only apply to a new farming activity with farming inside a high natural character area should be controlled and inside an outstanding natural character area RDIS.	Amend PER-1 of Rule CE-R4 as follows: ~~The farming activity is located outside high or outstanding natural character areas.~~ The rural production activity is lawfully established or a new rural production activity outside high or outstanding natural character areas. Amend activity status where compliance with PER-1 not achieved: ~~Discretionary (outside an outstanding natural character area)~~ ~~Non-complying (inside an outstanding natural character area)~~ Controlled inside high natural		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					character areas Restricted Discretionary inside an outstanding natural character area Amend the reference to 'farming' to 'rural production' activities		
FS548.054	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers submitted on this rule and sought that existing, lawfully established farming activities were provided for permitted activities within high or outstanding natural character areas in the coastal areas. For Council not to do so will place huge impediments in front of farmers to be able to continue their operations.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS346.016	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately manage effects in the coastal environment.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.239	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.253	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.275	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S243.096	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-R4	Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment when combined with the ONL or ONF overlay. This does not implement policy CE-P6 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in the coastal environment. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, working farms are in the coastal environment. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on	Delete rule CE-R4 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule CE-R4 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay. Amend rule CE-R4 as follows: Activity status: Permitted ~~Where: PER-1~~ ~~The farming activity is located outside high or outstanding natural character areas.~~ Activity status where compliance		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the coastal environment are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	~~is not achieved with PER 1:Discretionary (outside an outstanding natural character area)Non-complying (inside an outstanding natural character area)Activity status where compliance not achieved: Not applicable~~		
FS570.654	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.668	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.690	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S169.006	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R5	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R5 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R5 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S177.006	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R5	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R5 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General	Amend Rule CE-R5 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment			
S463.064	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-R5	Support	WBF agrees with the unequivocal provision of a permitted activity status for demolition in the coastal environment.	Retain Rule CE-R5		Reject
S511.101	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-R5	Support in part	CE-R5 fails to require the removal of demolished materials from a site	Amend with conditions requiring the removal of demolition material		Reject
FS164.101	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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).	Reject
FS570.1672	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1686	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1708	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S442.120	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-R5	Support in part	CE-R5 fails to require the removal of demolished materials from a site.	Amend with conditions requiring the removal of demolition material.		Reject
FS346.731	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other	Allow	Reject	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.		
S169.007	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R6	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R6 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R6 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S177.007	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R6	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R6 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment.	Amend Rule CE-R6 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S259.016	Nicole Wooster	CE-R6	Support in part	Is the intent to control the planting of exotic plantation forests such as pine trees or any type of plantation forest e.g. manuka or totora? This may take on more importance as farmland is converted into different land uses with govt regulations promoting land use changes through freshwater regs and future emission taxes. Marginal farmland in the coastal environment may be converted into forestry for either milling or carbon credits. This is applicable to our property as a portion of the farm is in the coastal environment and environmentally / economically over time it may be more suited to forestry or carbon credits. You may for example plant manuka to then collect the oil as well. If you allowed the area to naturally regenerate (to avoid needing a consent under the rule) then it would potentially be considered a SNA therefore you would want to have a plantation forest to be exempt.	Amend rule to consider whether only exotic trees should require resource consent.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS176.2	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	While SFNZ supports the submitters point regarding the need for landuse flexibility, the submitter relief seeks to "pick winners" based on the provenance of vegetation rather than managing any adverse effects.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS85.29	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	No rationale would impose restrictions on an exotic plantation and would not be imposed on any other plantation. It does not make sense. The rules should be equal and fair to all land users.	Disallow		Accept in part
S148.033	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	CE-R6	Not Stated	The chapter on the Coastal Environment fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. While the notes to this chapter refer to the Plan's ability to establish more stringent rules that the NES-PF, no justification for this has been provided in the section 32 report and, doing so, would fail to meet the wider policies and objectives of the Plan for example PRROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04, and RPROZ-P1.	Delete CE-R6		Accept in part
FS85.28	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Summit Forest New Zealand Limited's submission to delete Rule CE-R6, as it does not consider the existence of plantation forestry within the Coastal Area. Plantation forestry is long-term land use, and this rule will impose a greater prohibition or restriction on the activity. Therefore a more detailed s 32 analysis is required. To remove the certainty of harvest and the ability to undertake other plantation forest activities is unreasonable and not commensurate with evidence-based policies.	Allow		Accept in part
FS346.539	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.145	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S160.026	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	CE-R6	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to rule CE-R6 as it is considered that making production forestry a discretionary activity is onerous and it is already established in the coastal environment and is a valuable land use in the prevention of erosion.	Delete rule CE-R6		Accept in part
FS85.30	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife's submission to delete Rule CE-R6, as it does not consider the existence of plantation forestry within the Coastal Area. Plantation forestry is long-term land use, and this rule will impose a greater prohibition or restriction on the activity. Therefore a more detailed s 32 analysis is required. To remove the certainty of harvest and the ability to undertake other plantation forest activities is unreasonable and not commensurate with evidence-based policies.	Allow		Accept in part
FS346.596	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.041	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R6	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Amend DIS-1 of Rule CE-R6 so that the activity is not located in high natural character areas as well as outstanding natural character areas		Reject
FS332.041	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S91.014	PF Olsen Limited	CE-R6	Oppose	There is no provision for non-complying activities under the Natural and Built Environments Bill. Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted. The permitted activity regulations of the NES-PF are appropriate to give effect to policies 11, 13, 15 and 22 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Plantation forestry is a long term land use, with considerable financial inputs decades before any financial benefits are realised. To remove certainty of harvest and the ability to undertake other plantation forest activities is unreasonable and not commensurate with evidence based policies. The section 32 analysis states that there are more stringent rules for plantation forestry rule to give effect to policy 13(2) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. Based on this, plantation forestry activities that have the potential to impact on natural character should be the focus, not all plantation forestry activities and not the existence of the plantation forest. This is justification for a restricted discretionary rule for new afforestation and a controlled activity status for the other plantation forestry activities that have the potential to impact natural character in the Coastal Environment, as well as a permitted activity framework for the existing plantation forests.	Delete Rule CE-R6 Amend Rule CE-R6 to only apply to the afforestation of land in the Coastal Environment. Amend Rule CE-R6 to only apply to those plantation forest activities that have the potential to impact natural character, and these should be controlled (RMA) or permitted (NBA) with appropriate matters of control or permitted activity standards.		Accept in part
FS566.103	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S169.008	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R7	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R7 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the	Amend Rule CE-R7 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment			
S177.008	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R7	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R7 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R7 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S431.042	John Andrew Riddell	CE-R7	Not Stated	The proposed Plan is set out in the atomistic way required by the National Planning Standards. As a consequence, in addition to the amendments sought to the Kororāreka Russell Township Zone provisions, there are amendments needed to other chapters of the proposed Plan, including the Coastal Environment Overlay, Historic Heritage and Subdivision provisions for the reasons set out with respect to the provisions in the Kororāreka Russell Township zone.	Amend DIS-1 of Rule CE-R7 so that the activity is not located in high natural character areas as well as outstanding natural character areas		Reject
FS332.042	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S169.009	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R8	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R8 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R8 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S177.009	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R8	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R8 is an unnecessary constraint on	Amend Rule CE-R8 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment.			
S511.102	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-R8	Support	Support prohibition on any new mineral extraction activities in the coastal environment	Retain CE-R8		Accept
FS196.228	Joe Carr		Oppose	submitter's request is unreasonable. the district has many roads in coastal areas that need maintenance. A well maintained road and rip rap lined side drains reduce sediment that otherwise would significantly contaminate the environment. Good quarry rock deposits are not common and cannot be needlessly sterilised.	Disallow		Reject
FS164.102	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS570.1673	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1687	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1709	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.121	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-R8	Support in part	Support prohibition on any new mineral extraction activities in the coastal environment.	Retain CE-R8.		Accept
FS346.732	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S169.010	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-R9	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R9 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R9 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S177.010	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-R9	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R9 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Rule CE-R9 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
S511.103	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	CE-R9	Support	Support prohibition on land fills, managed fills and clean fills	Retain CE-R9		Accept
FS164.103	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1674	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS566.1688	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1710	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S442.122	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-R9	Support	Support prohibition on land fills, managed fills and clean fills.	Retain CE-R9.		Accept
FS346.733	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S82.012	Good Journey Limited	Standards	Oppose	The standards of the Coastal Environment Overlay are not supported by appropriate analysis, do not meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and do not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991. The standards within the Coastal Environment overlay do not recognise different attributes and apply a generic set of rules that are unwarranted in an urban environment. The net effect of the coastal environment overlay provisions is that all newly built form or extensions within an urban zoned area (which contains both residential and mixed use development zones) will trigger full discretionary resource consent for any development which exceeds one storey in height, exceeds the height of the nearest ridgeline, increases the floor area by more than 20%, is not finished in a BS5252 colour palette and has a reflectance value greater than 30%.	Delete the requirements for resource consent for building additions exceeding 20% in GFA, buildings exceeding one storey in height, reference to specific colours and reflectivity limitations in urban areas.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S345.008	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Standards	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	Reject
S330.004	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Standards	Support in part	The submitter supports in part standards in the Coastal Environment (inferred), however the PDP approach does not appropriately justify some provisions as no specific locality assessments have been undertaken to suggest that they are appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend standards in the Coastal Environment (inferred) to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.	Accept in part
S179.071	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Standards	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain standards	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.103	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's coastal environs.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.033	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	Support to the extent consistent with our primary submission. Agree consideration needs to be given to how such overlays apply or are integrated into urban zones.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S29.008	Bayswater Inn Ltd	Standards	Oppose	Coastal Environment Overlay - With regard to the inclusion of 40 Marsden Road, Paihia, in the coastal environment overlay, the PDP has introduced new rules which have an impact on the subdivision status, along with the future development of the sites. The creation of lots in the coastal environment would in terms of subdivision be assessed as a Discretionary Activity, whereas it is currently a Controlled Activity. Some of the restrictions on future development are illogical and unreasonable	Amend the coastal environment rules to exempt existing/established urban areas (including 40 Marsden Road, Paihia) from the restrictions on future development including: • maximum floor area of 300 m² • maximum extension of 20% • limits on excavation and filling • maximum height of 5 metres • additional controls on indigenous vegetation removal • subdivision as a discretionary activity		Accept in part
FS400.029	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	The submission opposes the Paihia Heritage Overlay which seeks to depart from the Environment Court 2005/2006 decision. The decision of the Environment Court should be retained.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S565.005	The Paihia Property Owners Group	Standards	Support in part	The report provided by Melean Absolum Limited, that supports the Coastal Environment s32 Report prepared by Council, only suggests potential rules for the Coastal Environment within an urban area. There is no detailed evidence provided within either report to support these 'suggestions'. The PDP includes to rules such as a 5m height limit, 300m ² building / floor area coverage, and 400m ² indigenous vegetation and earthworks limits within an urban area. There is limited rationale as to why and how these provisions were selected. it is not clear why 5m was selected, or why this height limit is appropriate. No specific locality assessments have been undertaken specifically to suggest that this is appropriate in a highly modified urban environment such as Paihia.	Amend the standards within the Coastal Environment to promote more enabling and appropriate provisions as they relate to urban areas such as Paihia.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS348.221	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S179.080	Russell Protection Society (INC)	CE-S1	Support in part	for example the permitted height limit within the overlay is 5m (CE-S1) whereas the permitted height in the Kororareka Russell township zone is appropriately set at 7.2m (KRT-S1)	Amend Coastal Environment overlays within urban areas following an investigation of the challenges in applying		Accept in part
S210.001	Paul Hayman	CE-S1	Oppose	The steep topography of submitters site at 277 Wainui Road means it isn't possible to build a house which could comply with this rule (5m maximum height) without huge excavations.	Amend the standard to the maximum height of the zone in which the property is located in.		Accept in part
S293.003	Bruce and Kim Rogers	CE-S1	Oppose	This standard is prohibitive and the permitted standard in the MUZ in area B in 10m. A 5m height for a two-story building with 2.4m high floors is not practicable.	Amend CE-S1 to reflect the permitted Mixed Use Standard MUZ-S1 in Area B of 10m maximum height.		Accept in part
S497.009	Mark John Wyborn	CE-S1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the height of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
S253.006	IDF Developments Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The 5.0m height limit will restrict building design and layout options. This should be increased to 6.0m. The reference to the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula is void for certainty and should be removed. There is too much ambiguity with this wording and should be removed	Delete the maximum height of 5.0m and the reference to " <i>the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula</i> " (inferred)		Accept in part
S494.011	Ian Jepson	CE-S1	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the height of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
S536.008	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	CE-S1	Oppose	Limiting the maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level to 5m has total disregard to development options and desecration of land values. No logic or reason are given for this change.	Delete Standard CE-S1 and retain status quo (inferred)		Accept in part
S386.014	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew	CE-S1	Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew's consider that the built form of urban zones is part of the established values of these environments. It is considered that these height limits in urban zones have not been	Delete CE-S1 Or Amend CE-S1 to make reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				thoroughly assessed, and reliance on the underlying zone thresholds will sufficiently manage the effects. Further, Ballantyne & Agnew consider the wording in clause (1) refers to the 'nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula' needs to be reconsidered. These terms are not defined, and may cause interpretation issues of how and when these apply to a particular relevant. Particularly in locations where there are multiple ridgelines and headlands, Russell township is a perfect example of this with two headlands that encompass the bay and various ridgelines that define the town. Ridgeline, headland and peninsula are not defined terms and are somewhat subjective terms to include within rule criteria for the purpose of determining whether consent is required or not. It is also unclear as to whether the rule is intending to protect the skyline within the CE or act as a generic visual amenity consent trigger. If the former, we consider the rule could be reworded to make reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland or peninsula".	or peninsula". And Insert definitions of ridgeline, headland and peninsula.	
S476.004	David Truscott	CE-S1	Oppose	The coastal environment height limit of 5 metres conflicts with the adopted Rawene Design Guidelines where 2 storey buildings are recommended. RPS objective 3.14 does not set absolute protection in all cases and can accommodate a degree of modification. This flexibility should apply in Rawene.	Amend policy CE-S1 to increase permitted building heights from 5m to 8m in the Rawene HHA Part A.	Accept in part
S177.011	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S1 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment.	Amend Standard CE-S1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF.	Reject
S463.065	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The imposition of a generic 5m permitted height limit over all land in the coastal environment is a very notable change introduced by the Proposed Plan. This is likely to heavily constrain some landowners'	Amend the exclusions within Standard CE-S1 to also exclude Special Purpose Zone - Kauri Cliffs	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ability to use and develop land in accordance with its zoned purpose. This highly conservative and all encompassing proposed rule is not mandated by any provisions of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, the Proposed Regional Plan for Northland August 2022 - Appeals Version, nor by the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The planning issues created by the introduction of a resource consent requirement for buildings taller than 5m are apparent when considering the Special Purposes Zones. Such zones are, according to the Kauri Cliffs s32 report: "...locations where detailed site assessment and development have been completed by way of a resource consent, development plan, structure plan or master plan to result in outcomes for the area, managed by way of area specific objectives, policies and methods. Each Special Area is unique, with individual circumstances, site constraints, surrounding environment, resource management issues and development potential". Given the foregoing, the Special Purposes Zones anticipate, and provide individualised planning frameworks for, unique developments. Introducing a 5 m permitted height limit as proposed by this rule contradicts the bespoke development outcomes that have previously been considered and embedded in the Special Purpose Zones, in Kauri Cliffs case since the commencement of the Operative Plan in 2009.		
S503.016	Waitangi Limited	CE-S1	Not Stated	Amendment to the permitted height allowance is requested. Within the underlying Operative zone rules, the minimum permitted height is 8 metres, with the exception of the rural production zone which allows for 12 metres. The coastal zone covers a large area of rural zoned land which has a functional need to establish sheds for machinery and general farm buildings which would easily exceed the 5m threshold. Enabling an 8m height restriction ensures most farm buildings are able to comply with the standard. The additional requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula provides additional mitigation in comparison to the existing rule set. We do note that the Melean Landscape	Amend point 1 of Standard CE-S1 as follows: 1. The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is ~~5~~8m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula. In the event that an 8m height restriction is not accepted we seek further relief that a 6m height restriction be accepted as generally most single story houses would fit within this height restriction. In the event the above relief is not accepted, we	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Assessment does discuss a 5m height restriction as being acceptable. However, this report provides little justification as to why a 5m height restriction has been utilised. We do note that generally many single-story houses which are constructed exceed a 5m height restriction.	seek that the changes apply insofar as the Waitangi Estate.		
S167.079	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building. The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard CE-S1		Accept in part
FS143.32	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the submission point that the maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage (as has been done already at Mataka).	Allow		Accept in part
FS393.019	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS405.072	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.016	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 167	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.441	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S493.011	William Goodfellow	CE-S1	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the height of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.			
FS67.118	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.115	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS393.027	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The reason contained within the Original Submission No 493.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.036	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The reasons within the Original Submission No 493	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S283.001	Trent Simpkin	CE-S1	Oppose	A maximum height of 5m for any standard house or building is very difficult to achieve. No zone in the old District Plan had a max height of under 8 metres. To add to this, most of the coastal land in the Far North is sloping, and we are now forced by the definition of 'Height' to only use Rolling Height as a method (average height method has been removed) so therefore nearly all new homes will breach this maximum height rule. It is not possible to building a house on a sloping site without breaching 5m maximum height, which will mean hundreds of resource consents for FNDC to process.	Amend maximum height to 8m as per the old District Plan.		Accept in part
FS45.13	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS113.4	Martin OBrien		Support	The height of 5m will be extremely difficult to achieve as coastal buildings are often on slopes. It wouldn't take much of a slope to breach this rule resulting in a lot of resource consents. We have had a project in Access Road, Kerikeri, where the consent notice restricted the height to 6m, this was very hard to achieve but manageable. This could perhaps be managed with a management plan at subdivision setting out rules and eliminating RC's.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.815	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.829	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.851	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S287.003	Tristan Simpkin	CE-S1	Oppose	A maximum height of 5m for any standard house or building is very difficult to achieve. To add to this, most of the coastal land in the Far North is sloping, and we are now forced by the definition of 'Height' to only use Rolling Height as a method (average height method has been removed) so therefore nearly all new homes will breach this maximum height rule. No zone in the old DP had a max height of under 8m. It is not possible to build a house on a sloping site without breaching a 5m maximum height, which will mean hundreds of additional needless resource consents for FNDC to process. For example:, assume a flat building site, FFL will be around 700mm for a timber floor, Stud Height 2550 or 2700, Truss Height approx 2000 = over 5m already for a very standard home. Add a sloping site to this scenario and all of a sudden the breach is large.	Amend maximum height to 8 metres (as per the Operative District Plan).		Accept in part
FS29.25	Trent Simpkin		Support	It is near impossible to build a house under a 5m height restriction, especially if you add a sloping site (and therefore rolling height method goes	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				against the design) and a timber floor. I support increasing this to 8m, as currently is around the district.			
FS401.021	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 287.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.874	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.888	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.910	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S320.010	Far North Holdings Limited	CE-S1	Not Stated	The submitter considers that the insertion of additional sub-clauses into standard CE-S1 Maximum height, is appropriate and necessary relief to achieve the aims of this submission (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert the following into standard CE-S1 Maximum height, as follows: 1. The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is 5m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula. 2. Any extension to a building or structure must not exceed the height of the existing building above ground level or exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula. This standard does not apply to: i. The Orongo Bay zone ii. the OMDA, the Mixed Use Zone at the Opuā Marina, where the maximum height limit is 16m. iii. Marine Business Park, Commercial Estate, and Colenso Triangle where the maximum height limit is 12m.		Accept in part
FS107.4	Laurell Douglas		Support	Per above	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S123.001	Lynley Newport	CE-S1	Support in part	I would like see an increase from 5m to 6m. In the numerous applications I have prepared for buildings in outstanding landscapes and General Coastal Zone of the Operative District Plan I have come across many examples where the architect, in endeavouring to introduce some interesting angles and recesses and features that help mitigate the visual impact of the building, has slightly encroached a 5m height limit. Without increasing the risk of visual impact, I believe the standard can be relaxed to 6m. I also believe that the limitless and ill defined nature of the wording of the rest of CE-S1, items 1 & 2 could lead to over zealous interpretation of the standard and require consent when none should be required. For example what if the nearest 'ridgeline', headland or peninsula is on another property, or more than 1km away?	Amend CE-S1. 1: The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is 6m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula within or adjacent to the property. Similar wording change should be made to CE-S1. 2.		Accept in part
FS172.210	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS405.071	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendments as, they note in their original submission they sought to delete CE-S1 or amend it to reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland or peninsula.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S251.008	New Zealand Maritime Parks Ltd	CE-S1	Oppose	NZMPL consider that the maximum 5m building height standard inadequately acknowledges the heights of existing buildings established in urban areas. For instance, many buildings already established within the Opuia industrial park exceed 5m in height and have a functional and operational need to do so, i.e., marine services that accommodate large boats and equipment	Amend the height limits proposed in Standard CE-S1 and provide tailored height limits for each zone.		Accept in part
FS407.005	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission is supported on the basis that the 5m height limit in areas such as Opuia does not cater to marine related services. The submission also seeks tailored height limits for each zone subject to the Coastal Environment Overlay which is supported.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS400.013	The Paihia Property Owners Group		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS396.013	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	Submission 251 rightly notes that the underlying analyses related to the Coastal Environment provisions has not sufficiently considered the appropriate implementation of these provision in the urban environment. Specific provisions such a height limits and gross floor area restrictions (for example) require flexibility when considered against the urban environment values and existing environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS542.068	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
S250.018	Willowridge Developments Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The narrow approach for the management of height in the CE is considered to inadequately provide for the variable values of existing environments and underlying zones. Fails to take into account areas that are zoned either mixed use or industrial where height limits are set at 12m, with many existing buildings that already exceed this proposed limit. The 5m height limit is considered inappropriate in these environments.	Review the height limits proposed in CE-S1 and provide tailored height limits for each zone.		Accept in part
FS407.008	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission correctly notes in our opinion that that provision CE-S1 Building Height does not provide for the variable values of existing environments and underlying zones.	Allow	allow the original submisison	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS542.067	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
FS332.265	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Existing controls are appropriate in this coastal area.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.704	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.718	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.740	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S341.012	Ed and Inge Amsler	CE-S1	Oppose	A 5m height limit imposed by the standard seems to be at odds with the residential / commercial intent of the MUZ. For example, a 5m height limit does not provide genuine bottom floor commercial and above ground residential uses. It is likely that residential activities will not be favourable in this zone, although should be supported with more enabling height provisions in the Coastal Environment.	Amend the 5m height limit to be increased in urban areas to a more appropriate limit, particularly where the Mixed Use Zone is present in CE-S1.		Accept in part
FS407.0010	Far North Holdings Limited		Support	The submission relates to the Coastal Environment provisions (building height) specifically in relation to the Mixed Use Zone. The submission seeks greater permitted height limits which is supported	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS542.074	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
S496.009	Philip Thornton	CE-S1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the height of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS411.009	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part
S495.007	Ricky Faesen Kloet	CE-S1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the coastal environment overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and colour of buildings.	Delete CE-S1 (inferred).		Accept in part
FS410.007	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS405.082	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.043	John Andrew Riddell	CE-S1	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend standard CE-S1 so that it does not apply to any urban zone as well as not applying to the Orongo Bay zone.		Accept in part
FS398.007	Waitoto Developments Limited		Support	It is agreed that CE-S1 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Zone.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS542.077	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.043	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S168.077	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m ² structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage	Delete Standard CE-S1		Accept in part
FS405.073	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S169.011	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-S1	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S1 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Standard CE-S1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF		Reject
FS405.074	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports in part the submission point to amend Standard CE-S1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay, but notes that in their original submission they sought to delete CE-S1 completely or to amend the standard.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S187.068	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage or the building.	Delete Standard CE-S1.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m² structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.			
FS405.075	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S222.071	Wendover Two Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m ² structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard CE-S1		Accept in part
FS405.076	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S243.097	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m² structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard CE-S1		Accept in part
FS405.077	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.655	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.669	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.691	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS369.458	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified	Disallow		Accept in part
S248.004	Richard G A Palmer	CE-S1	Support in part	CE-S1 makes no real allowance for buildings built on sloping land. 5m is simply too low where a single level house will not comply	amend CE-S1 to increase the maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level to 8m		Accept in part
FS405.078	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendments, as they note in their original submission they sought to delete CE-S1 or amend it to reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland or peninsula.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S263.035	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-S1	Oppose	The submitter considers that standard CE-S1 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this standard.	Delete standard CE-S1 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.		Accept in part
FS405.079	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports in part the submission point to amend Standard CE-S1 so that it does not apply to land within the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone, but notes that in their original submission they sought to delete CES1 completely or to amend the standard.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS332.246	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	All of the Coastal Environment rules should apply to this highly visible site adjoining Orongo Bay.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
S333.069	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best	Delete Standard CE-S1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m2 structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.			
FS405.080	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S350.001	Chris Sharp	CE-S1	Oppose	Do not apply a blanket approach to properties in the coastal environment. Opito Bay is a well established built environment with no undeveloped sites. A number of dwellings are built to the maximum height currently permitted. Many are located on ridgelines and beach frontage, highly visible from a wide visual catchment. For this reason the proposed restrictions are unreasonable and will not mitigate any effects that are not already existing.	Delete rule CE-S1 or amend to establish thresholds that are more fitting with the development.		Accept in part
FS405.081	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support in part	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the submission point to delete CE-S1 or amend the standard, but notes that in their original submission they sought to amend CE-S1 to make reference to the "height of the tallest/highest surrounding ridgeline, headland or peninsula	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
S368.003	Far North District Council	CE-S1	Support in part	This standard affects a number of built up urban areas across the district. Further investigation is required to determine whether urban zones should be excluded from this standard, given the sliding scale of 'natural character' from urban to rural and the already built up nature of existing 'urban' areas.	Delete urban zones from this standard, if further investigation shows that it is appropriate in the Coastal Environment.		Accept in part
FS401.022	Carrington Estate Jade LP		Support	The submission and the associated submission points seeks retentions, amendments and deletions, and	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	and Carrington Farms Jade LP			consequential relief which is not consistent with the purpose of the Act			
FS542.076	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
S285.001	Leisa Henwood	CE-S1	Oppose	The permitted height in the Mixed Use zone is 10m. A 5m maximum height is not practicable as many sites in Paihia are steep and a 5m height would not even allow a 2 storey dwelling.	Amend standard CE-S1 to make the permitted mixed use height 10m.		Accept in part
FS542.069	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
S256.003	Josh Henwood	CE-S1	Oppose	The permitted height under the Mixed Use area is 8.5 metres. The 5m proposed height under the Coastal Environment zone allows for only 1 level. On steep sites, this is not practical, and much of Paihia is on steep sites.	Amend standard to align with Mixed Use Zone maximum height of 8.5 metres.		Accept in part
FS542.070	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
S289.001	Terry Henwood	CE-S1	Oppose	The permitted height in the Mixed Use zone is 10m. A 5m maximum height is not practicable as many sites in Paihia are steep and a 5m height would not even allow a 2 storey dwelling. A 5m height does not allow scope for new motels in Paihia. Zone A1 does not affect any rear neighbours as to height.	Amend standard CE-S1 to make the permitted mixed use height 10m.		Accept in part
FS542.071	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
S294.005	Bruce and Kim Rogers	CE-S1	Oppose	The permitted standard in the Mixed Use Zone in Area A (Paihia) is 8.5m and a 5m maximum height for a two-storey building within 2.4m high floors is not practicable.	Amend standard CE-S1 to reflect the permitted Mixed Use standard in Area A of Paihia which is 8.5m.		Accept in part
FS542.072	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
S313.001	Chris Sharp	CE-S1	Support	Doves Bay is a well-established built environment, that includes few undeveloped sites. A fair	Delete the rule or establish more appropriate thresholds that are more fitting with development,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proportion of dwellings are built to the maximum heights currently permitted. Many are located on the ridgeline, highly visible from a wide visual catchment. For this reason, the restrictions on development are unreasonable and will not mitigate any effects that are not already existing.	i.e do not apply a blanket approach to properties in the coastal environment.		
FS542.073	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support in part	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow in part	delete commercial zones from this rule.	Accept in part
S344.014	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-S1	Not Stated	It is considered that this standard places unnecessarily restrictive rules upon urban areas such as Paihia within the CE where amenity and character has already been compromised	Amend CE-S1 to exclude land zoned MUZ, RSZ and LIZ or any equivalent commercial zone, to enable development to occur in accordance with the underlying zone provisions.		Accept in part
FS542.075	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs considers commercial zones should be excluded from this rule.	Allow	delete commercial zones from this rule	Accept in part
FS396.035	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S502.018	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-S1	Support in part	Amendment to the permitted height allowance is requested. Within the underlying Operative zone rules, the minimum permitted height is 8 metres, with the exception of the rural production zone which allows for 12 metres. The coastal zone covers a large area of rural zoned land which has a functional need to establish sheds for machinery and general farm buildings which would easily exceed the 5m threshold. Enabling an 8m height restriction ensures most farm buildings are able to comply with the standard. The additional requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula provides additional mitigation in comparison to the existing rule set.	Amend point 1 of Standard CE-S1 as follows: 1. The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is 58m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula. In the event that an 8m height restriction is not accepted we seek further relief that a 6m height restriction be accepted as generally most single story houses would fit within this height restriction.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				We do note that the Melean Landscape Assessment does discuss a 5m height restriction as being acceptable. However, this report provides little justification as to why a 5m height restriction has been utilised. We do note that generally many single-story houses which are constructed exceed a 5m height restriction.	In the event the above relief is not accepted, we seek that the changes apply insofar as the Waitangi Estate.		
FS547.032	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to amend the permitted height for buildings within the Coastal Environment to 8m to reflect the zoning provisions. This will enable a functional height for buildings within the Coastal Environment and will retain a consenting pathway for buildings which protrude above the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
FS332.227	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The Orongo Bay Zone is located in a highly visible coastal location and hence the 5m height control is appropriate.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS305.030	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Support the change sought to amend the permitted height for buildings within the Coastal Environment to 8m to reflect the zoning provisions. This will enable a functional height for buildings within the Coastal Environment and will retain a consenting pathway for buildings which protrude above the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S259.013	Nicole Wooster	CE-S2	Support in part	Bridges over coastal areas, boat ramps and wharfs would be regulated by this standard. Clause 2 is impracticable as we do not paint our wharf. Further graves and associated headstones may also be inadvertently captured by this rule and not comply.	Amend to practically regulate graves, bridges, wharfs and boat ramps or provide for their natural finish.		Accept in part
S333.070	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.		Accept in part
S497.010	Mark John Wyborn	CE-S2	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the exterior finishes of new buildings		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.	
S458.004	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	Under CE-S2, paint colour and reflectivity is specified. Countdown's 'pawpaw green' colour has a light reflective value of 12%, but given this is a custom colour it is not located within this generic Resene colour palette and therefore any repainting of the existing store or additions to the store would require resource consent as a Discretionary Activity. This is considered unnecessary for a paint colour that is used and accepted nationwide with no known visual effects, and maintains a low light reflectivity which is understood to be the intent of such rule.	Amend Rule CE-S2 where it restricts the exterior colours of buildings. This should only restrict the reflectivity value and not specify a pre-approved colour palette.	Accept in part
S169.012	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-S2	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S2 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Standard CE-S2 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S168.078	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	Accept in part
S494.012	Ian Jepson	CE-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the exterior finishes of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.	Reject
S187.069	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	
S177.012	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-S2	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S2 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Standard CE-S2 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject
S263.036	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that standard CE-S2 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this standard.	Delete standard CE-S2 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.	Accept
S222.072	Wendover Two Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	Accept in part
S503.017	Waitangi Limited	CE-S2	Not Stated	Reference to the BS5252 standard colour range has been removed. Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour palette range. The Resene BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is therefore very outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilised. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%,	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a light reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. ~~have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined~~	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue). Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilised which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.	~~within the BS5252 standard colour palette.~~ In the event this relief is not accepted we ask that Council make the following changes to point 2: If painted have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or equivalent product		
FS51.35	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with s.5(h), HNZPTA. As a National Landmark, HNZPT advises that the planning framework applied to the extent of the Landmark site definition (as identified in the Landmark document Listing - Te Pitowhenua Waitangi Treaty Grounds documents 2019.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com) must strongly support the retention and protection of the heritage resources and the heritage values of the place. The management of buildings and structures within TE Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds, and the impact the exterior of buildings and structures must be strictly controlled to ensure the protection of the place's significant heritage values of the Treaty Grounds. Some of which are viewed from the wider setting and viewpoints, such as from Kororareka Russell.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
S167.080	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.		
FS143.33	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the submission point that buildings in the coastal environment should also be allowed to be natural finish stone or timber.	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.442	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S493.012	William Goodfellow	CE-S2	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the exterior finishes of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Reject
FS67.119	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS393.028	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The reason in the Original Submission No 493	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.037	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The reasons within the Original Submission No 493	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S283.002	Trent Simpkin	CE-S2	Support in part	There is no allowance for timber i.e. cedar/larch, or concrete, steel, aluminium finishes. Referencing the BS5252 colour palette means that the color has to be painted, whereas it is beneficial in many coastal areas to use natural products like timber cladding with stained finishes.	Amend standard to read ' if the exterior surface is painted , it must have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette'		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS45.14	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.816	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.830	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.852	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S287.002	Tristan Simpkin	CE-S2	Support in part	There is no allowance for timber i.e. cedar/larch, or concrete, steel, aluminium finishes. Referencing the BS5252 colour palette means that the color has to be painted, whereas it is beneficial in many coastal areas to use natural products like timber cladding with stained finishes.	Amend the standard to read: 'if the exterior surface is painted, it must have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette'		Accept in part
FS29.26	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree fully with this suggestion, but the rule needs to actually state other materials like concrete, timber, etc.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.873	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.887	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.909	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S502.019	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	Reference to the BS5252 standard colour range has been removed. Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour palette range. The Resene BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is	Amend CE-S2 The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a light reflectance value no greater than 30%. ~~2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				therefore very outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilised. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%, the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue). Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilised which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.	~~palette~~ or if not accepted 2-If painted have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or equivalent product		
FS446.029	Omata Estate		Support	Support the decision sought subject to appropriate wording.	Allow	Amend CE-S2	Accept in part
FS547.033	Heron Point Limited		Support	Support the decision sought.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.031	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	No reasons stated.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S496.010	Philip Thornton	CE-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the exterior finishes of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.		Accept in part
FS411.0010	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay be removed from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
S495.008	Ricky Faesen Kloet	CE-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the coastal environment overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and colour of buildings.	Delete CE-S2 (inferred).		Reject
FS410.008	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.			
S344.015	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	CE-S2	Not Stated	It is considered that this standard places unnecessarily restrictive rules upon urban areas such as Paihia within the CE where amenity and character has already been compromised	Amend CE-S2 to exclude land zoned MUZ, RSZ and LIZ or any equivalent commercial zone, to enable development to occur in accordance with the underlying zone provisions.		Accept in part
FS542.078	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs supports amendments to exclude land zoned MUZ-RSZ and LIZ.	Allow	amend to exclude land zoned MUZ-RSZ and LIZ.	Accept in part
FS396.036	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S243.098	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also which typically sit well in the coastal environment.	Amend Standard CE-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.		Accept in part
FS570.656	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.670	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.692	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S259.011	Nicole Wooster	CE-S3	Support in part	A family cemetery is located in the coastal environment. It is unclear if earthworks associated with a cemetery would be permitted. The rules do not provide for it as an activity and it would breach these standards due to the depth and area over a course of 10 years. However, Council may consider that this would be covered by existing use rights for a lawfully established cemetery.	Amend Standard CE-S3 to ensure operations of an existing cemetery are provided for in the rules or have Council confirm that this is not required as it is covered by existing use rights.		Accept in part
S333.071	P S Yates Family Trust	CE-S3	Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m ²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend Standard CE-S2 (CE-S3 inferred) as follows: <i>Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):</i> 1. <i>not occur in outstanding natural character areas.</i> 2. <i>not exceed a total area of 50m² for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan per calendar year</i> in an area of high natural character. 3. <i>not exceed a total area of 400m² for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan per calendar year</i> in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. <i>not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1m-1.5m.</i> 5. <i>screen any exposed faces visible from a public place.;</i> or 6. <i>be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform.</i> <i>Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or</i>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					<i>vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.</i>	
S497.011	Mark John Wyborn	CE-S3	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend provisions limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks be deleted.	Reject
S407.001	Tapuaetahi Incorporation	CE-S3	Support in part	In terms of the Coastal Environment provisions, CE-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is not at all reasonable in the context of a working farm, which a large part of the landholding is. Operational requirements associated with farming offer many examples as to why these rules are considered overly onerous. This includes: - Changes to farm race track alignment and widening; - Providing farm infrastructure such as troughs, yards, and fences.	Amend CE-S3: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m ² for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 2,5400m² for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1m. 5. screen any exposed faces. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part
S169.013	Suzanne Linda Ashmore	CE-S3	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S3 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment	Amend Standard CE-S3 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S168.079	Setar Thirty Six Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply	Amend Standard CE-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 400m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~1m~~ 1.5m. 5. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place; or 6. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part
S253.007	IDF Developments Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	The proposed provisions work against the enabling intent of the Rural Productive Zone. Earthworks and vegetation clearance go hand in hand with a productive farming environment. The provisions are too restrictive, and it is unclear how Council will actively monitor the earthworks component of the provision, particularly in relation to a 10 year threshold and a 1m cut for standard rural activities. In that sense, the provisions are unlikely to achieve any value or link to the objectives proposed	Delete the 400m ² limitation on earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance in the Coastal Environment and the 1m cut or fill depth limitation (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S493.013	William Goodfellow	CE-S3	Oppose	The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks be deleted.	Reject
S494.013	Ian Jepson	CE-S3	Oppose	Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, and imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Amend provisions limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks be deleted.	Reject
S187.070	The Shooting Box Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, to the following: earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m ²); it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted; life of district plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season; and screening should only be from public places.	Amend Standard CE-S2 (CE-S3 inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m ² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 400m ² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~1m~~ 1.5m . 5. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place; or 6. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					may require consent from the Regional Council.	
S341.013	Ed and Inge Amsler	CE-S3	Oppose	When coupled with development in the Mixed Use Zone, the effects of earthworks are likely to be temporary in nature. The sediment and erosion control requirements are already outlined in the Earthworks Chapter and in many cases there will be limited approaches to manage the temporary visual amenity effects from earthworks as the rules seem to be targeting.	Amend the following: where earthworks in the Mixed Use Zone are required alongside development, the provisions should enable a greater area and cut / fill depths; and, to screen all exposed faces or require a resource consent should only relate to those faces which can be seen from a public place.	Accept in part
S491.006	Eric Kloet	CE-S3	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Standard CE-S3 limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks.	Reject
S177.013	Cavalli Properties Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Standard CE-S3 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment.	Amend Standard CE-S3 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF.	Reject
S222.073	Wendover Two Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m2). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and	Amend Standard CE-S3 as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan per calendar year in an area of high natural character.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	3. not exceed a total area of 400m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~1m~~ 1.5m. 5. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place.; ~~or~~ 6. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	
S463.066	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	CE-S3	Not Stated	If the relief sought in respect of the deletion of the ONC80 layer from the Totara Forest is not granted (refer to submission points S463.056 to S463.058), WBF seeks that this rule is amended to provide a discretionary pathway for earthworks and vegetation removal within the ONC80, given that this area has been modified and needs ongoing maintenance to provide amenity to guests and future residents of Kauri Cliffs. Sub-clause (2) needs to be amended as 50 m² per calendar year is much more appropriate than 50 m² per 10 years. The latter is highly conservative, and these effects can be managed with appropriate management plans. For areas outside the HNC area there is no need for such a conservative approach and a discretionary activity provides and appropriate pathway.	Amend points 2. and 3. of Standard CE-S3 as follows: 2. not exceed a total area of 50 m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year, in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 400 m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas.	Accept in part
S490.006	Owen Burn	CE-S3	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous	Delete the provisions of Standard CE-S3 limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.		
S492.006	Ironwood Trust Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings	Delete the provisions of Standard CE-S3 limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks.	Reject
S502.020	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CE-S3	Support in part	It is understood that some controls are needed on indigenous vegetation clearance within the coastal environment, which is why no changes have been proposed to the stated amount. While the 10-year timeframe is easily able to monitor from aerials for vegetation clearance, for earthworks this is not the case. This is especially evident on larger blocks which are farmed where small scale earthworks are undertaken regularly. It is considered more appropriate to allow 400m ² of earthworks per calendar year for sites within the coastal environment overlay. This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing farming activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 400m ² area. The provision for 400m ² of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the coastal environment overlay are adhered to.	Amend point 3 of Standard CE-S3 as follows: 1. For indigenous vegetation clearance - not exceed a total area of 400m² for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan and for earthworks - not exceed a total area of 400m² per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. In the event Council does not accept the relief above, we seek that this applies to Waitangi Estate only.	Accept in part
S503.018	Waitangi Limited	CE-S3	Not Stated	It is understood that some controls are needed on indigenous vegetation clearance within the coastal environment, which is why no changes have been proposed to the stated amount. While the 10-year timeframe is easily able to monitor from aerials for vegetation clearance, for earthworks this is not the	Amend point 3 of Standard CE-S3 as follows: 1. For indigenous vegetation clearance - not exceed a total area of 400m² for 10 years from	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				case. This is especially evident on larger blocks which are farmed where small scale earthworks are undertaken regularly. It is considered more appropriate to allow 400m ² of earthworks per calendar year for sites within the coastal environment overlay. This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing farming activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 400m ² area. The provision for 400m ² of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the coastal environment overlay are adhered to.	the notification of the District Plan and for earthworks - not exceed a total area of 400m² per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. In the event Council does not accept the relief above, we seek that this applies to Waitangi Estate only.	
S167.081	Bentzen Farm Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. As drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend Standard CE-S2 (CE-S3 inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m ² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 400m ² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~1m~~ 1.5m . 5. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place.; or 6. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.		
FS143.34	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with the amendments sought to the rule that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause limitations on volumes etc.	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.443	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S122.002	Lynley Newport	CE-S3	Support in part	Rule IB-R1 permits certain indigenous vegetation clearance in "All Zones", including up to 1,000m2 clearance to provide for a single residential unit, on-site services and its access, and to create or maintain a setback between a vulnerable building and vegetation. I have supported both these permitted activity clearance provisions, albeit it submitted that 1,000m2 is insufficient for dwelling, on-site servicing and access. No reference back to IB-R1 is included in CE-R3, PER-1. Given the clear intent of IB-R1, which is to recognise there are certain instances where limited indigenous vegetation clearance should be permitted, there should be a reference to this permitted activity in CE-R3, PER-1. CE-S3 is too restrictive overall. To make any indigenous clearance in an outstanding natural character area in the coastal environment a non complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire. Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non complying activity is ridiculously restrictive. I suggest a bit of re-set for CE-R3, PER-1, PER-2 and S3.	Amend CE-S3 to read: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. Not exceed a total area of 50m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of outstanding natural character. 2. Not exceed a total area of 100m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of high natural character. 3. Not exceed a total area of 500m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. Not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1.5m and screen any exposed faces.		Accept in part
FS28.027	Dr John L Craig		Support	CE-S3 is too restrictive overall. To make any indigenous clearance in an ONC area in the coastal environment a non-complying activity is overly limiting and in conflict with objectives and policies in the Natural Hazards chapter regarding wildfire.	Allow	Amend CE-S3 as follows: '1. Not exceed a total area of 50m2 for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of outstanding natural character. 2. Not exceed a total area of 100m2	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Also to make any cut/fill face of more than a 1m height a non complying activity is very restrictive.		for 10years from the notification of the District Plan in an area of high natural character. 3. Not exceed a total area of 500m2 for 10years from the notification of the District Plan in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. Not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1.5m and screen any exposed faces.	
S496.011	Philip Thornton	CE-S3	Oppose	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unnecessarily onerous (inferred).	Amend provisions limiting the aerial extent and height of cut and fill of earthworks be deleted.		Reject
FS411.011	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory	Allow	remove the ONL overlay be removed from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject
S495.010	Ricky Faesen Kloet	CE-S3	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the coastal environment overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Delete CE-S3 (inferred).		Reject
FS410.0010	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S511.104	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	CE-S3	Support in part	Support strict limits on vegetation clearance and earthworks in high and outstanding natural character areas. Particularly CE-S3(3) appears to	Amend CE-S3 to ensure alignment with any amendments to CE-R3 above to make sure these		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand			override the IB provisions in regards to SNAs. This is not clear and should be tightened up.	rules and standards are at least as strict as the IB chapter or even stricter.		
FS164.104	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS548.169	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support in part	The deletion of Rule CE-R3 will make CE-S3 unnecessary. If Rule CE-R3 is not deleted Federated Farmers considers the notified version CE-S3 appropriate.	Allow in part	Grant the relief sought if Rule CE-R3 is deleted.	Accept in part
FS570.1675	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1689	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1711	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S263.037	Waitoto Development Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	The submitter considers that standard CE-S3 should not apply to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone which should be exempt from this standard.	Delete standard CE-S3 as it applies to the Orongo Bay Special Purpose Zone.		Reject
FS332.247	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	All of the Coastal Environment rules should apply to this highly visible site adjoining Orongo Bay.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
S527.025	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	CE-S3	Oppose	PDP standard CE-S3 allows an excessively large area (up to 400m2) earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance in areas that are not high or outstanding natural character areas.	Amend to reduce the earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance in areas that are not high or outstanding natural character areas (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS277.56	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.1887	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S243.099	Matauri Trustee Limited	CE-S3	Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply	Amend Standard CE-S2 (CE-S3 inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not occur in outstanding natural character areas. 2. not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area of high natural character. 3. not exceed a total area of 400m² ~~for 10 years from the notification of the District Plan~~ per calendar year in an area outside high or outstanding natural character areas. 4. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~1m~~ 1.5m. 5. screen any exposed faces visible ~~from a public place;~~ or 6. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.		Accept in part
FS570.657	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.671	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.693	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S529.150	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	CE-S3	Support	PDP standard CE-S3 allows an excessively large area (up to 400m2) earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance in areas that are not high or outstanding natural character areas. A Note under CE-S3 incorrectly refers only to a 10m setback distance in the NES-F in relation to regional council consent, when in fact the NES-F provisions also cover some activities within 100m of a natural wetland that require consent from the regional council. The Note should be amended.	Amend CE-S3 note to reflect NES-F provisions		Accept in part
FS570.2038	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2052	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2074	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.123	Kapiro Conservation Trust	CE-S3	Support in part	Support strict limits on vegetation clearance and earthworks in high and outstanding natural character areas. Particularly CE-S3(3) appears to override the IB provisions in regards to SNAs. This is not clear and should be tightened up.	Amend CE-S3 to ensure alignment with any amendments to CE-R3 above to make sure these rules and standards are at least as strict as the IB chapter or even stricter.		Accept in part
FS346.734	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S527.026	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	CE-S3	Oppose	Note under CE-S3 incorrectly refers only to a 10m setback distance in the NES-F in relation to regional council consent, when in fact the NES-F provisions also cover some activities within 100m of a natural wetland that require consent from the regional council.	Amend the note to give effect to the NES-F		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1888	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S368.047	Far North District Council	GRZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend GRZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;		Accept
S502.062	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	GRZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend GRZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;		Reject
S259.018	Nicole Wooster	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	In the rural environment it is not uncommon where a farm has coastal water access that wharfs or boat ramps exist for private use, especially in places like the hokianga (e.g our family farm) where prior to roads being constructed access was obtained via	Amend standard to consider whether wharfs/boat ramps should be exempt from the set back rules in relation to the MHW.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the river and harbour network. However, the rule does not appear to provide for a setback exemption for these types of activities.		
S333.093	P S Yates Family Trust	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S4	Accept in part
S497.012	Mark John Wyborn	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained (inferred).	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.	Reject
S368.048	Far North District Council	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend RPROZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S168.101	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S4	Accept in part
S253.004	IDF Developments Limited	RPROZ-S4	Not Stated	The relief sought draws off an existing exemption from the setback rules in the Operative District Plan where the setback provision does not apply to a legally formed and maintained road between the property and the coastal marine area, lake or river (refer 12.7.6.1.1(vii)). This approach should be extended also to areas promoted (or already existing) as esplanade reserves, crown grants, or similar landholdings as they effectively serve as a buffer in many instances.	Amend Standard RPROZ-S4 to include an exemption where there is a landholding (i.e. crown grant, road, or reserve) that separates a site from MHWS	Accept in part
S493.014	William Goodfellow	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas and in the coastal environment are thus considered to be inappropriate in this context and will make the continuation of reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.	Reject
S494.014	Ian Jepson	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S491.007	Eric Kloet	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4	Reject
S490.007	Owen Burn	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4	Reject
S492.007	Ironwood Trust Limited	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	Not stated	Delete Standard RPROZ-S4	Reject
S502.052	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RPROZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend RPROZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 30m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S187.104	The Shooting Box Limited	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7	Accept in part
S503.035	Waitangi Limited	RPROZ-S4	Not Stated	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt. The definition for a Structure includes any building, equipment, device, or other facility, made by people and which is fixed to land; and includes any raft.	Insert New PER-2 in Standard RPROZ-S4 as follows: PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 30m	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There are many structures fixed to land such as stock fences that have a functional requirement to be located within 26m of the MHWS. Exclusion of this is consistent with NATC-R1. Lighting poles by or on behalf of FNDC have been sought as these are generally within legal road (which assumes the zoning of the neighboring site) or within park areas. In the case of the Waitangi Estate, the site contains a boat ramp and other infrastructure utilized by the general public which may at times require lighting not covered by a designation. Exclusions have been sought for footpaths and paving for both private and public use. In terms of the Waitangi Estate footpaths and paving convey people from Paihia onto the site and through to the Treaty grounds, and the Haruru Falls walking track among other uses. Generally, these are setback more than 30m from the coast but there are instances on the site where existing shell pathways are within the setback which may at some point require an upgrade. A 2m wide footpath has been sought to enable easy passing by two mobility scooters. The impact of sealing pathways is considered minor. Boundary fences and walls are also sought to be excluded so long as they are no more than 2m in height. This is because they are now captured under the definition of structure.	setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority or NZTA; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level.		
FS51.40	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA. As a National Landmark, HNZPT advises that the planning framework applied to the extent of the Landmark site (as identified in the Landmark document Listing - Te Pitowhenua Waitangi Treaty Grounds documents 2019.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com) must strongly support the retention and protection of the heritage resources and the heritage values of the place. As such, it is considered the proposed standard	Allow in part		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would not be suitable within the National landmark area extent of Te Pitowhenua/Treaty Grounds.			
S496.012	Philip Thornton	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	The imposition of controls intended to manage development make the reasonable use and development of the property unnecessarily onerous (inferred).	Amend provisions requiring buildings within the Rural Production Zone be setback 30 metres from MHWS be deleted.		Reject
FS411.012	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory	Allow	remove the ONL overlay be removed from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject
S495.011	Ricky Faesen Kloet	RPROZ-S4	Oppose	N/A	Delete RPROZ-S4 (inferred).		Reject
FS410.011	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S243.123	Matauri Trustee Limited	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain Standard RPROZ-S4		Accept in part
FS570.681	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.695	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.717	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S167.113	Bentzen Farm Limited	RPROZ-S4	Support	The standards, exclusions and matters of discretion are appropriate for buildings in the rural zone.	Retain RPROZ-S1 - RPROZ-S7		Accept in part
FS566.475	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S368.049	Far North District Council	RLZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend RLZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;		Accept
S168.145	Setar Thirty Six Limited	RLZ-S4	Support	The standard is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives	Retain Standard RLZ-S4		Accept in part
S502.055	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RLZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend Standard RLZ-S4 as follows: Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.115	The Shooting Box Limited	RLZ-S4	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.	Accept in part
S167.127	Bentzen Farm Limited	RLZ-S4	Support	The standards are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives.	Retain Standards RLZ-S1- RLZ-S6.	Accept in part
FS566.486	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part
S368.050	Far North District Council	RRZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend RRZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints ;	Accept
S502.058	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RRZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend RRZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S368.051	Far North District Council	RSZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' not 'constricts'	Amend RSZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S502.061	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	RSZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend Standard RSZ-S4 as follows: Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S368.052	Far North District Council	MUZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend MUZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S341.010	Ed and Inge Amsler	MUZ-S4	Oppose	There is no rationale provided outlining why the existing exemption has not been carried out in this instance. The current rule works against the	Delete 26m setback from MHWS for 46-48 Marsden Road, Paihia, and amend to include exemptions provided for in 12.7.6.1.1(vii) of the	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed 0m road setback and will force development to be located further from the road frontage.	ODP which allows for an exemption to the setbacks where there is a legally formed road.	
S320.017	Far North Holdings Limited	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	The submitter considers that standard MUZ-S4 Setback from MHWS, requires an additional clause relating to activities in a Marine Exemption Area, which is appropriate, as it better reflects existing, consented and proposed land uses (s32 assessment provided with submission).	Insert into standard MUZ-S4 Setback from MHWS an additional clause as follows: The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS. This standard does not apply to: i. activities in a Marine Exemption Area	Reject
S502.033	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	MUZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend MUZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S503.036	Waitangi Limited	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt. The definition for a Structure includes any building, equipment, device, or other facility, made by people and which is fixed to land; and includes any raft. There are many structures fixed to land such as stock fences that have a functional requirement to be located within 26m of the MHWS. Exclusion of this is consistent with NATC-R1. Lighting poles by or on behalf of FNDC have been sought as these are generally within legal road (which assumes the zoning of the neighboring site) or within park areas. In the case of the Waitangi Estate, the site contains a boat ramp and other infrastructure utilized by the general public which may at times require lighting not covered by a designation. Exclusions have been sought for footpaths and paving for both private and public use. In terms of the Waitangi Estate footpaths and paving convey people from Paihia onto the site and through to the Treaty grounds, and the Haruru Falls walking track among other uses. Generally, these are setback more than 30m from the coast but there are instances on the site where existing shell pathways are within the setback which may at some point require an upgrade. A 2m wide footpath has been sought to enable easy passing by two mobility scooters. The impact of sealing pathways is considered minor. Boundary fences and walls are also sought to be excluded so long as they are no more than 2m in height. This is because they are now captured under the definition of structure.	Amend Standard MUZ-S4 as follows:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWSPER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority or NZTA; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level.	Reject
FS51.41	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA. As a National Landmark, HNZPT advises that the	Allow in part	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				planning framework applied to the extent of the Landmark site definition (as identified in the Landmark document Listing - Te Pitowhenua Waitangi Treaty Grounds documents 2019.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com) must strongly support the retention and protection of the heritage resources and the heritage values of the place. As such, it is considered the proposed standard would not be suitable within the National landmark area extent of Te Pitowhenua/Treaty Grounds.			
S74.040	Brownie Family Trust	MUZ-S4	Support	The provision provides protection from flooding and sea level rise. It also ensures access to waterways and the ocean.	Retain standard MUZ-S4 as notified.		Accept in part
FS542.115	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S4	Accept in part
S179.050	Russell Protection Society (INC)	MUZ-S4	Support		Retain MUZ-S4		Accept in part
FS542.116	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Oppose	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Disallow	amend MUZ-S4	Accept in part
S344.035	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	MUZ-S4	Not Stated	It is considered that a GFA of less than 400m2 with a default to discretionary activity where compliance cannot be achieved is particularly onerous within the MUZ given this is the only commercial zone providing for supermarket activities. It is considered that building bulk and scale should be managed separately to the scale of activities, MUZ-R1 note is confusing these effects, resulting unnecessary restrictions upon activities within the MUZ.	Amend Standards MUZ S1-S9 to give effect to the relief sought for MUZ-R1 (inferred)		Reject
FS542.117	Foodstuffs North Island Limited		Support	Foodstuffs seeks amendments to this standard to reflect amendments sought in MUZ-R1	Allow	amend MUZ-S4	Reject
FS396.056	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.		
S368.053	Far North District Council	LIZ-S4	Support	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend LIZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S502.063	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	LIZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend LIZ-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S45.026	Puketona Business Park Limited	LIZ-S4	Not Stated	PBPL considers the proposed standards are acceptable, as are the matters of discretion and restricted discretionary activity status where standards are proposed to be infringed.	Retain the Light Industrial zone standards, including the matters of discretion and restricted discretionary activity status where standards are to be infringed (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S432.041	Ngawha Generation Limited	LIZ-S4	Support	NGL generally considers that the standards notified are appropriate, subject to any necessary amendments based on the definition of relevant terms previously identified.	Retain Standards as notified, unless further amendments are consequentially required based on amendments to existing definitions or additions of new requested definitions sought by NGL.	Accept in part
FS369.561	Top Energy		Support	Ngāwhā Generation Limited is a subsidiary of Top Energy. Top Energy supports all submission points made by Ngāwhā Generation Limited	Allow	Accept in part
S368.054	Far North District Council	HIZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend HIZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site constricts constraints ;	Accept
S502.064	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HIZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend HIZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S368.055	Far North District Council	NOSZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the	Amend NOSZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints ;	
S502.065	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NOSZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend NOSZ-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2The building orstructure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure withinthe 26m setback from MHWS is required for:1. restoration andenhancement purposes; or2. natural hazardmitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wirefence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by,or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and orpaving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls nomore than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S368.056	Far North District Council	OSZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend OSZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site constricts constraints';	Accept
S502.066	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	OSZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend OSZ-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2The building orstructure, or extension or alteration	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	
S368.057	Far North District Council	SARZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend SARZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S502.067	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SARZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend SARZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock;	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					or4. Lighting poles by,or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and orpaving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or wallsno more than 2m in height above ground level;	
S502.068	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	CAR-S2	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Insert the following into CAR-S2 (inferred) 3. The building orstructure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure withinthe 30m setback from MHWS is required for:1. restoration andenhancement purposes; or2. natural hazardmitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wirefence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by,or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and orpaving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls nomore than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S368.058	Far North District Council	HZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend HZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S502.069	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend HZ-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to anexisting building or structure must be set back at least 30m from MHWS PER-2The building orstructure, or extension or alteration	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;		
S317.031	Two M Investments Limited	HZ-S4	Support	The submitter considers that standard HZ-S4 is providing for the operation of existing and future horticultural activities without a potential of new activities disrupting or hindering horticultural activity.	Retain standard HZ-S4.		Accept in part
FS172.106	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Oppose	For the reasons set out in my primary submission to delete the Horticulture Zone.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS566.952	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S368.059	Far North District Council	HPFZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend HPFZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;		Accept
S502.070	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	HPFZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend HPFZ-S4 Where: PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 30m from MHWS PER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					to an existing building or structure within the 30m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; 6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;		
S431.023	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-R1	Not Stated	The proposed Plan's objectives, policies, rules and standards do not ensure adequate recognition and protection of the historic heritage and character and amenity of Kororāreka/Russell.	Amend standard KRT-S4 setback) Rule KRTR-R1 inferred) from MHWS so that where the standard is not met because the building or structure or alteration to an existing building or structure results in a setback of 20 m or less from MHWS is provided for as a non-complying activity.		Reject
FS332.023	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S179.034	Russell Protection Society (INC)	KRT-S4	Support		Retain KRT-S4		Accept in part
S368.060	Far North District Council	KRT-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend KRT-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints ;		Accept
S431.017	John Andrew Riddell	KRT-S4	Not Stated	A bespoke zone, rather than the General Residential zone proposed in earlier drafts of the proposed Plan, reflects the importance of the town as an early contact town, the character of the town,	Insert two further matters of discretion EITHER: to restricted discretionary rules KRT-R1 new buildings or structures and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and the limitations on the capacity of wastewater infrastructure. This bespoke zoning has evolved over many years, based on archeological, historic and architectural studies in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s. Important components of these reports and studies and guidelines have not been adequately recognised and used to inform the zone's objectives, policies, rules and performance standards. The Council has a very useful Kororāreka/Russell Design Guideline that it does not refer to in the proposed Plan. The bespoke zoning is further supported by Environment Court decisions, including a decision on an appeal that introduced what is called 'The Russell Township Basin and Gateway Area' in the operative Far North District Plan ("the operative Plan"). This decision has been departed from in the proposed Plan, resulting in more onerous provisions in the proposed Plan than are necessary to protect the character and values.	extensions to existing buildings or structures, KRT-R2 impermeable surface coverage, KRT-R3, residential activity and KRT-R8 minor residential unit; OR - to standards KRT-S1 maximum height, KRT-S2 height in relation to boundary, KRT-S3 setback, KRT-S4 setback from MHWS, KRTS5 building or structure coverage, KRT-S6 outdoor living space, KRT-S7 fencing and boundary walls, KRT-S8 outdoor storage as follows: the extent of building area and the scale of the building and the extent to which they are compatible with both the built and natural environments in the vicinity; consistency with the Kororāreka/Russell Design Guidelines		
FS23.119	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	It is inappropriate to: - require compliance with design guidelines in the plan, given it would stymie the ability to adopt future best practice methods. - require avoidance of effects on all indigenous biodiversity rather than just significant indigenous biodiversity as per the higher order policy documents. - constrain development to areas that are able to be serviced by infrastructure, given the constraints in Kororāreka in connecting to public services. The opportunity should remain to allow onsite servicing.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.017	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S502.071	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	KRT-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend KRT-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWSPER-2 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHW is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;		Reject
FS372.015	John Andrew Riddell		Oppose	The matter in the submission is addressed in the relevant chapter (Natural Character) and relates to setbacks from rivers, lakes and wetlands. The submission seeks to expand this to apply to setbacks from the coastal marine area. This is not a matter of consistency as argued by the submitter. The proposed amendment does not recognise and provide for matters of national importance 6(a) and 6(d). It is inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S368.061	Far North District Council	MPZ-S4	Support in part	Typo: There is a typo within the Standard for 'Setback from MHWS' across all zones within the PDP, in matter of discretion d. should be 'constraints' nor 'constricts'	Amend MPZ-S4 Replace the word 'constricts' with 'constraints' in the standard for 'Setback from MHWS in all zones in the PDP. d. Natural hazard mitigation and site ~~constricts~~ constraints;	Accept
S502.072	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	MPZ-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend MPZ-S4 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	Reject
S502.073	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	MIZ-S1	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Amend MIZ-S1 Where:PER-1 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure must be set back at least 26m from MHWS PER-2The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 26m setback from MHWS is	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					required for:1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level;	
S502.074	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	OBZ-S3	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Insert the following into OBZ-S3 (inferred) The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure within the 3m setback from MHWS is required for:1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or5. Footpaths and or paving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no more than 2m in height above ground level	Reject
S282.018	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading	Rules	Oppose	New telecommunications infrastructure is not expressly provided for in the current rules as notified. It is noted that the Coastal Environment covers large areas of urban development within the	Amend the CE Section of the Plan to exempt telecommunications infrastructure activities from needing to comply with the provisions of CE. However it is considered that requiring	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited			district (given the many coastal settlements) and as such, the current rules framework would limit the development of infrastructure within the areas where such infrastructure is required to service communities throughout the district.	telecommunications infrastructure to comply with CE-S2 can provide an appropriate mitigation measure for instances where such infrastructure needs to be located within the Coastal Environment outside of natural character areas. A rule to this effect is considered appropriate.		
S431.138	John Andrew Riddell	QR-R1	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend the rule so that any proposal to set a building or structure less than 20 metres back from the coastal marine area, or from rivers and banks is a non-complying activity		Reject
FS332.138	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
S282.019	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Standards	Oppose	New telecommunications infrastructure is not expressly provided for in the current rules as notified. It is noted that the Coastal Environment covers large areas of urban development within the district (given the many coastal settlements) and as such, the current rules framework would limit the development of infrastructure within the areas where such infrastructure is required to service communities throughout the district.	Amend the CE Section of the Plan to exempt telecommunications infrastructure activities from needing to comply with the provisions of CE. However it is considered that requiring telecommunications infrastructure to comply with CE-S2 can provide an appropriate mitigation measure for instances where such infrastructure needs to be located within the Coastal Environment outside of natural character areas. A rule to this effect is considered appropriate.		Accept
S502.075	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	QR-S4	Support in part	Some consistency is sought with NATC-R1 which covers activities within proximity to a wetland, lake or a river margin. As such the layout of the rule has been changed to reflect this, while at the same time allowing for certain structures to be exempt.	Insert the following into QR-S4 (inferred) 3. The building or structure, or extension or structure within the 10m or 26m setback from MHWS is required for: 1. restoration and enhancement purposes; or 2. natural hazard mitigation undertaken by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 3. a post and wire fence for the purpose of protection from farm stock; or 4. Lighting poles by, or on behalf of, the local authority; or 5. Footpaths and		Reject Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					orpaving no greater than 2m in width; or6. Boundary fences or walls no morethan 2m in height above ground level		
S187.097	The Shooting Box Limited	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Oppose	Refer to full submission for reasoning in relation to High Natural Character Overlay on Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 97835and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 71896 (9715 m2) to exclude areas of planted gardens and low value manuka/kanuka.	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on the subject property legally described as Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 53930 (4.2152 hectares); and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 97835and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 71896 (9715 m2) to exclude areas of planted gardens and low value manuka/kanuka.		Accept in part
S421.141	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support the separation of natural character into high natural character (Schedule 7) and outstanding natural character (Schedule 8). Section 6(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 does not separate natural character out into separate categories. The section simply requires the preservation of natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, lakes, and rivers etc and their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Council is required to be consistent with the provisions of the Act. This includes Part 2 of the Act as well as its functions under the Act. The separation of natural character into two separate categories does not achieve this. The additional layers are unnecessary and add additional layers of complexity and unwarranted barriers. Where an area of natural character is located within a rural zone, the zone provisions along with the provisions for natural character will assist in its preservation and protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Rural zone provisions will manage the scale and density of buildings, earthworks, forestry, and subdivision, which are part of existing farming land uses that must be provided for as a right in the district plan.	Delete Schedule 7 Schedule of High Natural Character and Schedule 8 Schedule of High Natural Character, and create a single schedule for natural character (combining both of these Schedules).		Reject
FS165.1	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	To the extent relevant to Wiroa Station.	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS272.2	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujlich		Support in part	To the extent relevant to Mataka Station.	Allow in part		Reject
FS570.1373	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.375	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1387	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1409	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S451.024	Pacific Eco-Logic	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for high natural character and remove a few areas of high natural character that have been cleared since 2012. The latter is primarily in the Bay of Islands.		Reject
FS332.211	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS570.1529	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1543	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1565	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S303.002	Living Waters - Bay of Islands	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support in part	The inclusion of the Schedule is supported as it provides the reader with introductory information about the (largely) terrestrial parts of the natural character units measured and mapped in the RPS. However, many of the Unique Identifier numbers have been mistranscribed from the RPS data, making it difficult and confusing to dig deeper into the underlying maps, worksheets and tables in the RPS. For example, HNC187 has been given the identifier of 1-Oct instead of 01/10 and at the end of the mistranscriptions, HNC541 has been given the identifier Sep-36 instead of 09/36. This is probably because the underlying formatting in an intermediate Excel spreadsheet has used date formatting on the third column, rather than the general default format.	Amend to correct the misformatted Unique identifiers in the 3rd column to the correct format of "unit number/map number", rather than the inappropriate date format.		Accept
FS332.215	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
FS566.017	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.048	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS570.011	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
S574.001	Ecochic Properties Ltd	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Oppose	The 'High Natural Character' overlay recorded against 48 Taupo Bay Road (Lot 113 DP 56268) has been placed in error. There is no justification for the overlay. There is no native vegetation on the property (the reason why the overlay was placed).	Delete the 'High Natural Character' overlay recorded against 48 Taupo Bay Road (Lot 113 DP 56268)		Accept
FS348.025	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	Reject
S364.080	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect the natural character of the coastal environment in line with Policies 13 and 14 of the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 7 - Schedule of High natural character		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1161	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.220	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1175	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1197	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.168	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED7 - Schedule of High natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked.	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for high natural character and remove a few areas of high natural character that have been cleared since 2012. The latter is primarily in the Bay of Islands.		Reject
FS346.779	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
S463.057	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	Part of WBFs site is proposed to be included in the ONC80 area (151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236). WBF opposes the application of that layer to its property. For completeness, it also opposes this policy insofar as it would prohibit WBF's landscape maintenance activities and the upgrade and development of structures in the Totara Forest.	Delete ONC80 from SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character and the mapping notation shown on 151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236 OR delete Policy CE-P9.		Reject
S463.058	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	Part of WBFs site is proposed to be included in the ONC80 area (151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236). WBF opposes the application of that layer to its property. For completeness, it also opposes	Delete ONC80 from SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character and the mapping notation shown on 151 Tepene Tablelands Road, Matauri Bay, being Lot 1 DP 199909 and Lot 8 DP 50236 OR delete Policy CE-P9.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				this policy insofar as it would prohibit WBF's landscape maintenance activities and the upgrade and development of structures in the Totara Forest.			
S421.142	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support in part	Federated Farmers does not support the separation of natural character into high natural character (Schedule 7) and outstanding natural character (Schedule 8). Section 6(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 does not separate natural character out into separate categories. The section simply requires the preservation of natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, lakes, and rivers etc and their protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Council is required to be consistent with the provisions of the Act. This includes Part 2 of the Act as well as its functions under the Act. The separation of natural character into two separate categories does not achieve this. The additional layers are unnecessary and add additional layers of complexity and unwarranted barriers. Where an area of natural character is located within a rural zone, the zone provisions along with the provisions for natural character will assist in its preservation and protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. Rural zone provisions will manage the scale and density of buildings, earthworks, forestry, and subdivision, which are part of existing farming land uses that must be provided for as a right in the district plan.	Delete Schedule 7 Schedule of High Natural Character and Schedule 8 Schedule of High Natural Character, and create a single schedule for natural character (combining both of these Schedules).		Reject
FS165.2	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	To the extent relevant to Wiroa Station	Allow in part		Reject
FS272.3	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich		Support in part	To the extent relevant to Mataka Station.	Allow in part		Reject
FS570.1374	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.376	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
FS566.1388	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1410	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S463.122	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Oppose	The proposed ONC80 area does not have "near to pristine indigenous land cover". Numerous "human features" within and directly abutting the area present clearly apparent visual and acoustic modifications that cannot be described as "negligible". While the Totara Forest is undoubtedly a pleasant area that provides amenity for guests and visitors to Kauri Cliffs, it does not provide a "very strong experience of naturalness". On this basis WBF considers that it is inappropriate to apply ONC80 to the Totara Forest. The features and characteristics of this area are not consistent with the assessment criteria for areas of 'Outstanding Natural Character' stated in Appendix 1 of the Proposed Plan.	Delete ONC80 from Schedule 8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character		Reject
FS91.17	Moana Kiff		Oppose	We seek to retain schedule D8, ONC80, schedule of outstanding natural character. The stark contrast between WBFs highly manicured, artificial landscape of the golf course and the Totara Forest. The Totara Forest aligns with the criteria for natural outstanding character. We would argue that the forest is more than a pleasant area as it provides habitat for wildlife and the overall contribution of the forest to the local eco system.	Disallow		Accept
S451.025	Pacific Eco-Logic	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for outstanding natural character.		Reject
FS332.212	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS570.1530	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1544	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1566	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S303.003	Living Waters - Bay of Islands	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support in part	The inclusion of the Schedule of the Outstanding Natural Character units is fully supported, and because many of these are completely or partly terrestrial they should be included in a separate mapping overlay. The inclusion of the Schedule is supported as it provides the reader with introductory information about the (largely) terrestrial parts of the natural character units measured and mapped in the RPS. However, many of the Unique Identifier numbers have been mistranscribed from the RPS data, making it difficult and confusing to dig deeper into the underlying maps, worksheets and tables in the RPS. For example, ONC73 has been given the identifier of Feb-18 instead of 02/18. This is probably because the underlying formatting in an intermediate Excel spreadsheet has used date formatting on the third column, rather than the general default format.	Amend to correct the formatting of the Unique Identifier column to "unit number/map number", rather than the date formatting selected from an Excel spreadsheet		Accept
FS332.216	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
FS566.018	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.049	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.012	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
S364.081	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect the natural character of the coastal environment in line with Policies 13 and 14 of the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character		Accept in part
FS570.1162	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.221	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1176	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1198	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.169	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED8 - Schedule of Outstanding natural character	Support in part	Land use changes, vegetation succession and more detailed information/imagery obtained since 2012, indicate that the natural character mapping for a few locations should be updated. Some locations, primarily in the Bay of Islands and the Far North, should be more highly ranked.	Amend the natural character mapping to include additional locations for outstanding natural character.		Reject
FS346.780	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
S50.006	Vaughan Norton-Taylor	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Everything is discretionary not permitted. Disregard for options development and land values.	Not stated		Reject
S74.003	Brownie Family Trust	Coastal Environment	Support	The coastal environment is appropriate and does need appropriate planning provisions.	Retain the Coastal Environment overlay as notified		Accept in part
S151.004	NFS Farms Limited	Coastal Environment	Support	The High Natural character overlay (inferred: coastal environment overlay) is proposed to apply	Retain coastal environment overlay (as it relates to submitters landholdings (at 123 Rangitane Road,		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				along the coastal margins and in the gullies close to the coast on the submitters land at 123 Rangitane Road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469)). This overlay and associated provisions acknowledge the significant ecological and landscape qualities of the land and the potential to protect and enhance natural freshwater assets and indigenous vegetation.	Kerikeri 0294 (Lot 3 DP 184505) and 127 Rangitane road, Kerikeri 0294 (Lots 1 and 3 DP 502469) as notified.	
S90.001	Yvonne Sharp	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opito Bay is a built up residential area and is zoned coastal settlement. The Coastal environment overlay puts unreasonable conditions on an area that contains single and multi story dwellings and very small cottages, some of them the very original dwellings constructed in the bay. The Coastal Environment overlay is applied in a blanket manner that disregards long established settlements and applies rules for new builds or alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings and with the intent of the settlement zone.	Delete Coastal Environment Overlay from Opito Bay.	Reject
S90.002	Yvonne Sharp	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Coastal Environment overlay is applied in a blanket manner that disregards long established settlements and applies rules for new builds or alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings and with the intent of the settlement zone. The Coastal environment overlay applies district wide and does not take into account the differences in the levels of development existing in particular areas (which have been established under the provisions in the current operative district plan). For this reason it is inappropriate to have blanket provisions applying throughout the Coastal environment overlay. For example, if retained, the provisions applying for Opito Bay should be changed to align with the level of existing development which has created a built up environment adjacent to the coast, i.e. it is not pristine.	Delete Coastal Environment Overlay from built up areas (for example, Opito Bay), or create sublayers in the Coastal Environment Overlay to have regard to differing levels of development.	Reject
S313.002	Chris Sharp	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Doves Bay is a built up residential area and zoned both coastal settlement and rural lifestyle.. The Coastal environment overlay puts unreasonable conditions on this area that is made up of both single and multi storied buildings ranging in age from new to 50 years old. The Coastal Environments	Delete the Coastal Environment overlay for the Doves Bay area from the planning maps.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				overlay disregards established settlements and places rules on new builds and alterations that are inconsistent with the existing buildings and the intent of the settlement zone.		
S427.029	Kapiro Residents Association	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.	Reject
S508.002	Brian Francis Steere	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opito Bay is a built up coastal settlement with bachs and permanent housing on sections that range from 1000sqm to 3000sqm. The coastal environment overlay unduly restrict / applies rules on new construction /alterations that are inconsistent to the existing buildings	delete the coastal environment overlay from already well-established coastal settlements (such as Opito Bay)	Reject
S420.006	Muriwhenua Incorporated	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	Deletion of the 'coastal environment' overlay from the Muriwhenua land, other than thatland requested to be zoned Māori Development rural that is within 500m of mean highwater spring , and the sites currently used for housing or business activity to ensure that the overlay does not apply to the new Māori Development Rural Settlement zone sought through submission (also refer to submission points S420.004 and S420.005)	Delete the 'coastal environment' overlay from Muriwhenua land, being Te Hapua 42 Block (title identifier 517692, affecting land at Te Hapua Road and Waharua Road, Te Hapua) and Section 1 SO Plan 470881, Mokaikai Block (title identifiers 726749, NA1A/1450, NA2108/28 and NA738/244, affecting land at Te Hapua). Note: This shall exclude land requested to be zoned Māori Development Rural that is within 500 metres of mean high waterspring , and the sites currently used for housing or business activity. (Also refer to submission point S420.005)	Reject
S148.035	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	The chapter on the Coastal Environment fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within the Coastal Environment, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. While the notes to this chapter refer to the Plan's ability to establish more stringent rules that the NES-PF, no justification for this has been provided in the section 32 report and, doing so, would fail to meet the wider policies and objectives of the Plan	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry from the coastal environment overlay mapping.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for example PRROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04, and RPROZ-P1.			
FS85.50	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-01, PRROZ-03, PRROZ-04 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow		Accept
FS196.243	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept
FS346.541	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.147	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
S259.023	Nicole Wooster	Coastal Environment	Support in part	A portion of the access to our property is via a peice of legal road, which has never been maintained by the council since it was formed in the 1930s as it is the end of the road and is only used by us. We are not covered by the road designation as the requiring authority doesn't look after it. However, if we needed to upgrade it to provide better access or to get a larger vehicle in we would need to get a resource consent even though it's an existing road.	Amend rules to provide for road upgrades as a permitted activity (inferred from submission), or alter the location of the coastal environment mapping to not include the road (also see S259.022)		Accept
FS196.244	Joe Carr		Support	this is a ubiquitous matter. i support the principle of the submitter requests	Allow		Accept
S82.008	Good Journey Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Application of the Coastal Environment Overlay as shown on the planning maps to the geographic area spanned by Ngati Kahu Road on	Delete the Coastal Environment overlay from the geographic area spanned by Ngati Kahu Road on the western edge of Taipa to the Oruaiti River to		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the western edge of Taipa to the Oruaiti River to the east, encompassing the settlements of Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, and Mangonui is not supported by appropriate analysis, does not meet the provisions of s.32 of the Act, and does not accord with Part II of the RMA 1991.	the east, encompassing the settlements of Taipa, Cable Bay, Coopers Beach, and Mangonui		
FS275.52	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	As fully outlined in the submission already tabled - the scope and extent of the area caught by the proposal is unreasonable and will likely generate undesirable outcomes some of which are outlined in the submission already tabled.	Allow		Reject
S276.018	Russell Landcare Trust	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The coastal environment relies on regional council mapping, which deliberately understated the extent of the coastal environment. The Environment Court has confirmed this for Kaimaumau wetland, agreeing that all of that wetland is coastal environment, not just the thin strip shown in the Regional Council maps. This is of concern because the test in the coastal environment is an avoid adverse effects test (i.e. a higher threshold than outside of the coastal environment).	Amend extent of coastal environment to include all of the Kaimaumau wetland (not just the thin strip shown in Regional Council maps).		Accept
FS23.092	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	While it is accepted that there should be controls within the plan to appropriately provide for and manage effects on ecosystems and biodiversity, and that changes should be made to ensure that the provisions give effect to the higher order policy documents, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land. It is also noted that further changes may be required to give effect to the NPSIB.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought to the extent it goes beyond what is required by the higher order plan and policy documents.	Reject
FS332.186	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
FS570.813	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.827	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.849	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept
S394.062	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Coastal Environment	Support in part	Carrington estate meets many of the coastal environment criteria specified in App1. The connectivity between this location and Karikari Moana is obvious and well known in terms of Haitaitamarangai Marae/Te Whānau Moana and Te Rorohuri mātauranga.	Amend the maps to include the Carrington Estate zone within the coastal environment and include consequential amendments to the Carrington Estate zone provisions to align with the coastal environment provisions.		Reject
FS401.027	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Oppose	The coastal environment includes land with Carrington Estate, the boundary of which has been established from the former Mangonui District Scheme, the current ODP and more recently the Northland Regional Council Regional Policy Statement.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS363.062	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS538.062	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS537.062	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS536.062	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS535.062	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS533.062	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS532.062	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS531.062	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS530.062	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS529.062	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS528.062	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS527.062	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS526.062	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS525.062	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS524.062	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS523.062	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS522.062	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS521.062	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS520.062	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS519.062	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS518.062	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS517.062	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS516.062	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS515.062	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS514.062	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS513.062	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS512.062	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS511.062	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS510.062	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS509.062	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS508.062	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS507.062	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS506.062	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS505.062	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS504.062	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS503.062	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS502.062	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS501.062	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS500.062	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS499.062	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS498.062	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS497.062	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS496.062	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS495.062	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS494.062	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS493.062	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS492.062	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS491.062	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS490.062	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS489.062	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS487.062	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS486.062	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS485.062	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS483.062	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS482.062	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS481.062	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS480.062	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS479.062	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS478.062	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS477.062	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS476.062	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS475.062	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS474.062	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS473.062	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS472.062	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS471.062	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS470.062	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS469.062	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS468.062	Elias Reihaana-Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS467.062	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS466.062	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS465.062	Rangimarie Muru		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS464.062	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS463.062	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS462.062	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS461.062	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS460.062	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS459.062	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS458.062	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS457.062	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS456.062	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS455.062	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS454.062	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS453.062	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS452.062	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS451.062	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS450.062	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS447.062	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS440.062	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS439.062	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS436.062	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS435.062	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS434.062	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS433.062	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS432.062	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS431.062	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS430.062	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS429.062	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS428.062	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS427.062	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS426.062	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS425.062	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS423.062	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS422.062	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS421.062	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS420.062	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS418.062	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS417.062	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS416.062	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS415.062	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS408.062	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS388.062	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS387.062	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS386.062	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS385.062	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS382.062	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS381.062	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS380.062	Asleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS379.062	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS378.062	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS365.062	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS360.062	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS359.062	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS358.062	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS357.062	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS356.062	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS568.062	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS567.062	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS563.062	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS562.062	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS561.062	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS560.062	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS559.062	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS558.062	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS557.062	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS556.062	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS555.062	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS553.062	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS552.062	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS551.062	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS546.062	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS545.062	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS544.062	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS178.062	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS413.062	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S431.047	John Andrew Riddell	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	Although the Regional Policy Statement identifies the inland boundary of the coastal environment, it also provides for the coastal environment boundary to be revised where more detailed assessment of an area is applied. One example of this is where the Environment Court accepted that the coastal environment boundary for the Kaimaumu wetland extended further inland over all of the wetland. This proposed Plan does not show this. Policy CE-P1 does not preclude extending the coastal environment where application of the assessment criteria in APP-1 justifies it, regardless of whether it is so identified in the Regional Policy Statement or not.	Amend the coastal environment boundary to include all of the Kaimaumu Wetland (a wetland by the Rangaunu Harbour) within the overlay		Accept
FS332.047	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
FS404.035	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G supports mapping the coastal environment boundary as set out in the relevant Environment Court decision ³ . As the submitter	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				points out Policy CE-P1 does not preclude extending the coastal environment where application of the assessment criteria in APP-1 justifies it, regardless of whether it is so identified in the Regional Policy Statement or not. The D-G generally supports evidence-based mapping of the coastal environment, other zones and overlays. The D-G supports evaluating similar changes should they arise through this process.			
FS404.036	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The D-G supports provision for assessing measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change in considering subdivision applications.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S243.128	Matauri Trustee Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Proposed Plan mapping extends the Coastal Environment Overlay across Wainui Road, with an arbitrary straight sided triangle of land included on that side of the road. This triangle has no relationship with the coastal environment and does not satisfy the attributes and criteria in Appendix 1 of the RPS. Namely: 1. It is not an area where coastal processes, influences or qualities are significant, including coastal lakes, lagoons, tidal estuaries, saltmarshes, coastal wetlands, and the margins of these. 2. It is not an area at risk from coastal hazards. 3. It does not exhibit coastal vegetation and the habitat of indigenous coastal species including migratory birds, being farmed. 4. It does not have elements and features that contribute to the natural character, landscape, visual qualities or amenity values of the coastal environment, being inland from the dominant ridge. 5. It does not include items of cultural and historic heritage in the coastal marine area or on the coast (none are mapped in the planning documents and no archaeological sites are in this area as determined by Clough and Associates archaeological report). 6. It is not an inter-related coastal marine and terrestrial system, including the intertidal zone 7. It has no physical resources and built facilities, including infrastructure, that have modified the coastal environment. 8. It is not a flat, low-lying area.	Delete part of the Coastal Environment Overlay applying to 2118 Wainui Road, Matauri Bay (Part Matauri No 2H Block), deleting the area along the southeastern boundary shown on the map attached to submission.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				A more logical position for the demarcation of the coastal environment would be the first dominant inland ridge seaward of this location. The area of Coastal Environment sought to be excluded is shown on an attached map. There is scope for this change because under Policy 4.5.1 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement, refinement of the maps in accordance with Method 4.5.4 is contemplated. The RPS states that "Where following further detailed assessment, an area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps has been amended in accordance with Method 4.5.4, and the amended area is operative in the relevant district or regional plan, it shall supersede the relevant area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps". The related Method specifies that the coastal environment, and areas of high and outstanding natural character within the coastal environment, and outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes as shown in the Regional Policy Statement -Maps may be changed, provided the changes are: (i) Undertaken using the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1; and (ii) Shown in the regional or district plan.			
FS570.686	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.700	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.722	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S148.056	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Coastal Environment	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding, and High Natural Character, and Coastal Environment captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to	Delete any Coastal Environment overlay from plantation forest areas.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas			
FS346.562	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.168	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
S167.110	Bentzen Farm Limited	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The objectives, policies and rules in the Coastal Overlay in combination fail to recognise and provide for farming (including enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being) , and where the overlay applies to those parts of the property actively farmed, it therefore fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.	Delete the Coastal Overlay from the Bentzen Farms property (legally described as Lot 1 Deposited Plan 87944; Lot 3 Deposited Plan 479155; and Lot 4 Deposited Plan 479155 and Part Lot 4 Deposited Plan 38894 and Lot 5 Deposited Plan 38894 and Section 27-28 Block III Russell Survey District) if the alternative relief sought relating to the coastal objectives, policies and rules relating to farming activities is not met		Reject
FS566.472	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
S527.024	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Coastal Environment	Oppose	The Operative DP defined large areas of coastal land as coastal zones. In contrast, the mapped area of the PDP regards only a narrow band of land as 'Coastal environment'. Much of the coastal land in the ODP coastal zones is now Rural Production or other zone. This change greatly reduces the area of coastal land that can be protected by coastal provisions/rules. Large areas of coastal land visible from the marine area will have little or no protection for their visual qualities, character or other coastal values.	Amend to protected areas of coastal land visible from the marine area will have little or no protection for their visual qualities, character or other coastal values (inferred)		Reject
FS566.1886	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS180.5	Kim Taylor		Support	THE EXISTING SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE ("SKIZ") SHOULD BE REINSTATED IN THE	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PROPOSED NEW PLAN WITH ALL CONSEQUENT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROPOSED NEW PLAN COMMENTARY THE OPERATIVE DISTRICT PLAN CONTAINS(MY EMPHASIS IN RED):- “10.10 SOUTH KERIKERI INLET ZONE CONTEXT The South Kerikeri Inlet Zone is located along the southern edge of the Kerikeri Inlet and as such forms a part of the maritime gateway to the historic settlement of Kerikeri. Whilst predominantly rolling pastoral country, the landform also includes low-lying backshore flats, coastal flanks and areas of very steep and unstable terrain. While much of the coastal margin of the inner Kerikeri inlet has been urbanised, the coastal margins of this area retain their natural qualities being relatively free of built structures. The open spaces and rural nature of the area provide visual relief from the other more modified areas of the coast. Its visual importance is increased given its proximity to the more urbanised area of adjacent Kerikeri Township. It is an area of “contrast” between the more urbanised areas to the west and the lower lying area to the east. The Okura River to the west and the Waitangi Wetland to the east form natural boundaries that set this area apart. Because of its undulating nature, the entire area is not visible from any one location. The more elevated portions of the land which are visible from a wide area and those slopes facing the Inlet are particularly sensitive. Other areas are more introspective and contained. The natural character, open space and rural nature of the area are important to the visual context of the wider area. 10.10.1 ISSUES These issues supplement those set out in Section 10.1.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				10.10.1.1 The natural, open, rural and coastal character of the South Kerikeri Inlet Zone can come under pressure by development that is not sympathetic to that character. 10.10.1.2 Because of the generally smaller lot sizes, rural residential development in the coastal environment can have adverse visual effects and consequently can affect the amenity of the area for adjoining land owners and the public." The existing "SKIZ" was the result of thousands of hours of consideration and consultation including the local landowners, expert planners, environmental consultants , landscape consultants . Department of Conservation , Forest and Bird, planning lawyers , environment court judges, several hearings and finally an appeal before the Environment Court . It was agreed by all contributing parties, including the FNDC . There can have been few, if any areas, given as much time, professional and expert effort and consideration before the final inclusion of SKIZ in its current form in the operative district plan. As such it should be the "go to "provision for this area for the future proposed plan . If a change is proposed it should first undergo a similar intensive process and give very clear cogent resource management reasons, why it should be reviewed. None of this appears to have happened . The Resource Management Act has not substantially changed , the topography and location that "set this area apart" as described above has not (cannot) materially change and yet substantial changes are now proposed which , inter alia, double the residential intensity and now ignore the recognition of "sensitive areas " within SKIZ as shown in the operative plan. It can never be argued that there is a shortage of development/rural lifestyle land in the FNDC.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There appears to be no valid resource management justification for this proposed change. Do we really have to go through the same extensive process as last time to reach what, (given that the SKIZ was formulated from the best expert advice and agreed by the FNDC), can only be materially the same as last time.		
S75.002	Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley	High Natural Character	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay High natural character 452 (Hillslopes with kanuka-mixed broadleaved forest. Some unsealed roading) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: - Several kilometres of roading in place - Acres of land clearance - Buildings insitu - Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	Delete High natural character 452 (Hillslopes with kanuka-mixed broadleaved forest. Some unsealed roading) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa	Accept in part
S258.001	Margaret Ridge	High Natural Character	Oppose	The mapping boundaries for HCN439 include pastoral swards used historically for the low density grazing of stock.	Amend the boundary of HNC439 to remove pastoral areas so resource consent is not required for the existing activity of grazing.	Reject
S142.002	Dandy Developments Limited	High Natural Character	Oppose	The submitter considers that for Lot 2 DP 195378, located at 458A Hihi Road, Hihi, the boundary of the High Natural Character Overlay (Reference 151) should not intrude into the property boundaries.	Amend the boundary of the High Natural Character Overlay (Reference 151) so that it does not intrude into the property boundaries of Lot 2 DP 195378, located at 458A Hihi Road, Hihi.	Reject
S333.110	P S Yates Family Trust	High Natural Character	Oppose	The Proposed Plan mapping includes some open grassed areas on the properties as High Natural Character. These do not exhibit high natural character values and should be excluded. These include but are not limited to the grassed cleared area at 1 Kokinga Point Road	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on the subject properties at 1 and 23 Kokinga Point Road, Rawhiti, legally described as Lot 3 DP 71896 and Part Te Kokinga Block, to exclude existing open grassed areas from High Natural Character.	Accept
S497.001	Mark John Wyborn	High Natural Character	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the HNC overlay be removed from that part of the submitter's property [illustrated in the submission] that do not have these qualities such that the submitter can continue to use and develop his land in a manner consistent with its current residential use.	Amend to remove High Natural Character from Orokawa 3C 2A Block NA17A/1419 (187A Manawaora Road, Russell) [as illustrated in submission].	Reject
S168.152	Setar Thirty Six Limited	High Natural Character	Oppose	The Proposed Plan mapping includes small areas of open grass and gardens on the property as High	Amend the High Natural Character overlay on Lot 1 DP 36233 (being land owned by Setar Thirty Six	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Natural Character. These do not exhibit any natural character values and should be excluded. Under Policy 4.5.1 of the Regional Policy, refinement of the maps in accordance with Method 4.5.4 is contemplated. The RPS states that "Where following further detailed assessment, an area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps has been amended in accordance with Method 4.5.4, and the amended area is operative in the relevant district or regional plan, it shall supersede the relevant area in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps". The related method specifies that the coastal environment, and areas of high and outstanding natural character within the coastal environment, and outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes as shown in the Regional Policy Statement - Maps may be changed, provided the changes are: (i) Undertaken using the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1; and (ii) Shown in the regional or district plan. As maintained grass and gardens, the areas sought to be removed do not demonstrate any of the attributes and criteria listed in Appendix 1 of the RPS.	at Moturua Island) to exclude areas of open grass and gardens.	
S494.002	Ian Jepson	High Natural Character	Oppose	Lot 3 DP 48494 has imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays appear to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and do not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings, extensive lawns, outbuildings and roading. The majority of the site is devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove High Natural Character overlay from Lot 3 DP 48494.	Reject
S353.001	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till	High Natural Character	Support	The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are: - it better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land; - the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and	Retain parts of the High Natural Character overlay which applies to NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP197131) and NA119C/48 (Lot 1 DP189675). If the primary relief above is not proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	appropriately developed.	
S491.001	Eric Kloet	High Natural Character	Oppose	The property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) is a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds. The area enjoys an attractive aesthetic, but due to the predominantly human landscape qualities exhibited by the specific property and others within close proximity, which include significant buildings and infrastructure as well as roading it cannot be considered to meet the high bar of having the landscape values ascribed to it over the whole of the subject site. The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained. Therefore, the High Natural Character overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with the present planning regimen.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213)	Reject
S530.002	Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin	High Natural Character	Not Stated	There is approximately 3ha of remnant forest and 3.9ha of previously 'human mediated' land where the property was once used as a quarry. The 3.9 ha is the area we would like the HNC409 restrictions removed, and that part of the lot be rezoned residential. see submission for report	Amend the boundary line for high natural character area (HNC409) on Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect the landscape and history of the whenua.	Accept in part
S551.003	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	High Natural Character	Not Stated	Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC, HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach. see submission for figures. show the discrepancies in overlay mapping of the three plans, with the Northland Regional Plan in particular not including any mapping of ONC or HNC within the subject site or the adjoining Puwheke Beach area, and the extent of the ONC overlay on Puwheke Beach being less in the PDP compared to the RPS. Lucklaw Farm acknowledges that the mapping of the ONL overlay is very similar between the PDP and the RPS.	Amend and review the accuracy of the Draft Plan mapped HNC areas, including investigation and written clarification from NRC with respect to the discrepancies between the RPS and NRP	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S490.001	Owen Burn	High Natural Character	Oppose	The High Natural Character overlay at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay is inappropriate and impose unduly restrictive controls on the reasonable use and development of the site and adjacent land. The high natural character overlay does not reflect the existing state of the subject property or the surrounding land, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay (identified in the submission)		Reject
S492.001	Ironwood Trust Limited	High Natural Character	Oppose	The High Natural Character overlay at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission) does not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing buildings and other domestic infrastructure with the majority of the land not having qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from the property at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission)		Reject
S493.002	William Goodfellow	High Natural Character	Oppose	In particular the submitter considers that these overlays do not reflect the state of the subject property or the surrounding land as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape. In particular much of the land holding to the east of Rawhiti Road is given over to plantation forestry which has been recently harvested. In addition, land to the west of this road has recently been subdivided such that it will ultimately be developed for residential use. Accordingly, and as is evident from the aerial photograph below, the majority of the land is in reality devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove High Natural Character from parcels on Rawhiti Road, Rawhiti (identified in the submission).		Reject
FS67.111	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS68.109	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept
S148.054	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	High Natural Character	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for High Natural Character captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any High Natural Character overlay from plantation forest areas		Accept
FS108.22	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter.	Allow		Accept
FS346.560	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.166	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
S495.001	Ricky Faesen Kloet	High Natural Character	Oppose	The overlay appears to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and does not reflect the environment of the western end of Motuarohia Island and the subject property in particular. This part of Motuarohia Island is largely developed with holiday homes with domestic infrastructure. While these sites contain stands of bush these are discontinuous and do not create a coherent natural landscape unit. When considered in its entirety it does not exhibit the landscape qualities that could not reasonably be described as having high natural character. The overlay is inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Delete the High Natural Character overlay from Lot 6 DP 488661, Motuarohia Island.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS410.001	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow original submission	Reject
S567.002	Andr� Galvin	High Natural Character	Not Stated	There is approximately 3ha of remnant forest and 3.9ha of previously 'human mediated' land where the property was once used as a quarry. The 3.9 ha is the area we would like the HNC409 restrictions removed, and that part of the lot be rezoned residential. see submission for report	Amend the boundary line for high natural character area (HNC409) on Lot 1 DP 53506 (Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect the landscape and history of the whenua.		Accept in part
FS348.225	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S344.017	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	High Natural Character	Not Stated	The HNCA overlay as it applies to the subject site does not accurately reflect the existing landform and vegetation of the subject site.	Amend the spatial extent of the HNCA to remove any land below the 12m contour line.		Reject
FS396.038	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S75.003	Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley	Outstanding Natural Character	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay Outstanding natural character 109 (Hillslopes with	Delete Outstanding natural character 109 (Hillslopes with native conifer/mixed broadleaved		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				native conifer/mixed broadleaved forest including kauri & rimu emergents) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: - Several kilometres of roading in place - Acres of land clearance - Buildings insitu - Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	forest including kauri & rimu emergents) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa		
S551.002	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	Outstanding Natural Character	Not Stated	Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC, HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach. see submission for figures. show the discrepancies in overlay mapping of the three plans, with the Northland Regional Plan in particular not including any mapping of ONC or HNC within the subject site or the adjoining Puwheke Beach area, and the extent of the ONC overlay on Puwheke Beach being less in the PDP compared to the RPS. Lucklaw Farm acknowledges that the mapping of the ONL overlay is very similar between the PDP and the RPS.	Amend and review the accuracy of the Draft Plan mapped ONC areas including investigation and written clarification from NRC with respect to the discrepancies between the RPS and NRP.		Accept in part
S551.006	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	Outstanding Natural Character	Oppose		ONC area "OC44" should be mapped in accordance with the mapping shown in the RPS		Accept
S148.055	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Character	Not Stated	the Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding, and High Natural Character, and Coastal Environment captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any Outstanding Natural Character overlay from plantation forest areas.		Accept
FS346.561	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.167	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S449.042	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Many of the coastal areas that were zoned in coastal zones in the ODP are proposed as rural zones in the PDP, and the Coastal Environment area now covers a rather narrow coastal fringe. These changes have a negative effect, removing many of the protections that exist for coastal areas under the RMA and NZCPS.	Amend planning maps to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas, so that coastal landscapes, coastal character and coastal environments will be protected appropriately.		Reject
FS143.74	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The relief sought to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas is contrary to the RPS and the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.105	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought to add coastal overlays, or similar mechanism, to all coastal areas visible from marine areas is contrary to the RPS and the NZCPS.	Disallow		Accept
FS569.1841	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1858	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S568.004	Scrumptious Fruit Trust	Settlement Zone	Support in part	The requirement of the NPS - indigenous biodiversity as that applies to coastal areas are best fulfilled by a targeting "coastal settlement" zone. Northland has precious coastal habitat and environment justifying more nuanced zoning controls. in coastal margins where settlements mix residential and holiday home developments, and have adjacent areas of natural significance (eg Taupo Bay) some greater controls should be placed on certain activities to ensure the natural environment is protected - for example stronger controls on outdoor lighting, security lights, reflective material.	amend zoning of coastal settlements. Settlements that are within the coastal environment should be a separate "coastal settlement" zone		Accept in part
FS348.231	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S551.004	Lucklaw Farm Ltd	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The PDP has mapped ONC, HNC, and Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) using the mapping methods and assessment criteria contained within the RPS. Lucklaw Farms have concerns with respect to the accuracy and spatial extent of the ONC,HNC areas mapped within the PDP, specifically those identified	Undertake onsite ground-truthing to ensure the District Plan maps accurately reflect the features onsite recognising policy 4.5.2 and method 4.5.4 (2) of the RPS.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				within the subject site and the adjoining Puwheke Beach.			
S431.168	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend all objectives and policies where there is reference to protection for current and future generations, add “and intrinsic and natural values”.		Reject
FS332.168	Russell Protection Society		Support	Submission aligns with our values	Allow		Reject
FS404.058	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	Relief is consistent with the purpose of the Act.	Allow		Reject
S463.040	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	Rules	Support	WBF seeks the addition of a new rule to provide a restricted discretionary consenting pathway for the construction of walking trails in the High Natural Character (“HNC”) overlay. WBF intends to provide guest/visitor amenity, and connectivity and amenity for future residents in the Golf Living subzone, by developing a modest trail network between key features of the property. Large areas of Kauri Cliffs are in the HNC overlay. Initial plans for the trail network indicate that some walking tracks will intersect areas in the proposed HNC. In light of the purposes of the KCZ, that many areas in the HNC have been protected, maintained or enhanced through WBF’s efforts over the years, it is considered reasonable to provide a consenting pathway for this activity.	Insert a new rule as follows: NATC-R[X] Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where:RDIS-1 Tracks not for conservation or pest control purposes. Matters of discretion: 1. The location and purpose of the proposed track or fence, its alignment and potential adverse effects on the high natural character area, including fragmentation and loss of biodiversity;2. Whether any proposed indigenous vegetation disturbance associated with the activity will result in loss of habitat that supports or provides a key life function for ‘threatened’ or ‘at risk’ indigenous species; and 3. The extent to which unavoidable adverse effects of the proposed indigenous vegetation disturbance associated with the activity on areas of significant biodiversity can be remedied or offset through established or new biodiversity restoration programmes.		Accept in part