

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S440.006	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	General / Process	Support	It is important for empowered Authorities to research, initiate, fund weed control in SNA's and the greater environment which contain such weed sources.	Not stated		Reject
S451.011	Pacific Eco-Logic	General / Process	Support in part	The district plan does not include non-regulatory methods, especially those promoting and assisting landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna	Insert a package of non-regulatory methods to promote and assist landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. This could include 1. Rate relief/ postponement for areas under permanent/ long-term protection 2. Grants for plant and animal pest control, fencing and wetland restoration		Reject
FS93.5	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Do not support (1) the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants or sub-division processes. My rates are not for their use, and this cost, in the 20/21 year, \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density. - Agree with (2) if support is provided for fencing in poorer communities where dog owners cannot afford to fence, AND if Northland forests are predator fenced like Sanctuary Mountain Maungatautari.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS176.9	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	The DP should recognise and support landowners/managers that actively manage indigenous biodiversity.	Allow		Reject
FS108.1	Manulife Forest Management		Support	Many private landowners/managers maintain and enhance indigenous vegetation and should be supported and encouraged to do so.	Allow		Reject
FS88.47	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	1. Do not support rates relief when bans of companion animals are placed on properties. Support rates relief for other (reasonable and effective) means of protecting ecologically important spaces on private property.	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				2. Support, provided pets are not included in the category of "pests".			
FS332.198	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
FS570.1516	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
FS566.1530	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
FS569.1552	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
S448.003	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Process	Oppose	The ecological values of SNA's need to be protected.	Amend zoning of SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting to a special zoning or overlay for protected SNA's or give SNA's a status similar to a Reserve on private property.		Reject
FS67.3	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS170.1	Olga Neunzerling		Oppose	Our property has been mapped as a Significant Natural Area. We oppose to this decision. Our points are: The council states that there are Native Species like: Bats, lizards etc ...present on our property. As well as Kanuka shrub and Manuka shrub, swamp astelia etc... We would like to reassure the council that we are yet to see the bats, lizards and rare aquatic fauna anywhere near our property. We have been living here for 20 years. Kanuka is just a pest on the property and we are pulling the kanuka seedlings out of the soil to prevent	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				it from overtaking other tree species. During the 20 years that we have been living here the council has never checked the rare fauna and flora on our property. Because it does not exist. They can do a lot more for the rare species(by poisoning the rats and possums etc...) without mapping our property as a Significant Natural area. That will be the real help to the Native Flora and Fauna.			
FS68.4	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.3	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.3	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS569.1887	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1815	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S559.026	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Process	Support in part	The council should look at incentives rather than restrictive rules.	Amend to implement incentives and subsidies for landowners to protect and enhance their biodiversity.		Reject
FS151.334	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS23.272	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Reject
FS570.2216	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS348.053	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2230	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
FS569.2252	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
S429.012	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Process	Not Stated	We consider that the PDP should take on board the changes proposed in submissions made by Forest & Bird, Pacific Eco-Logic and Marianna Fenn. In cases where our proposed changes differ, we seek the changes that will provide the strongest protection for the natural environment.	Amend District Plan as sought by Forest & Bird (submitter 511), Pacific Eco-Logic (submitter 451) and Marianna Fenn (submitter 542), unless relief sought by Kapiro Residents Association is more onerous		Accept in part
FS25.007	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Elements of the submissions by Forest & Bird, Pacific Eco-Logic and Marianna Fenn are appropriate, however, it is questionable whether some of the relief sought is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA or the objectives of the FNDP.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part, subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S354.024	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Process	Oppose	District Plan provisions are being over ridden by practice notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or the district, and raises questions about the statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district.	Amend the supporting planning documents to make available critical documents such as SNA and Kiwi areas, along with any all other undisclosed relevant information, such as the Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Funa and the Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map so that the public can understand the impact on pet ownership that may occur from the framework in the Proposed District Plan (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.1033	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
FS566.1047	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
FS569.1069	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
S442.155	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Process	Support in part	The district plan does not include non-regulatory methods, especially those promoting and assisting landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.	Insert a package of non-regulatory methods to promote and assist landowners to protect significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. This could include 1. Rate relief/ postponement for areas under permanent/ long-term protection 2. Grants for plant and animal pest control, fencing and wetland restoration		Reject
FS346.766	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
S48.002	Paul O'Connor	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	making owners carry out pest control while excepting DOC from this responsibility is unfair and unworkable given DOC own the majority of land often adjacent to private blocks. Many lot owners already carry out pest control and this should be encouraged	Amend provisions to get DOC to assist land owners with pest control and the Council assist with pest management a more proactive approach		Reject
S441.001	J L Hayes and Sons Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Volume 1 planning map 27 not adequate for planning purposes. Department of Conservation areas shown as Natural Open Space. Nothing shown as Summit Plantations or NZ Carbon Farming. The regional and district councils are involved in regulations for plantation forestry to ensure that infrastructure for future harvesting is not a burden on the ratepayers. Carbon farming is new and should not be shown within Rural Production zone. We have Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Areas at Mangapa which, referring to map 27 would not describe as significant.	Amend the description/zoning/overlays for land uses to better reflect areas of vegetation and non-rated land (inferred). When the Operative District Plan was produced prior to 2009, 30% was in Department of Conservation, 30% Maori land, 30% general title.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S440.001	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Reference the 1857 Survey plan (Fig 6 page 10 in the submission). Remnants within Teumutakiura have been fenced and stock free circa 2012. Existing forest outline remarkably similar to 1857 Survey relevant to 6969. These remnants mostly have a protection through their presence within the Heritage precinct. Now overlaid through SNA identification . It is also a gazetted Maori reserve, an Urupa. In my opinion the SNA designation placed by desk bound consultants over the urupa Teumutakiura is a gross insulting over-reach made through ignorance on their part of the land transaction which identified the purpose of that identified location for all time. A sacred place. The ignorance of the location and purpose of this tapu whenua on the part of FNDC reflects a dismal lack of knowledge through supporting that over-reach. FNDC support is an insult to Maori tikanga, mana whenua and the SNA designation must be removed.	Remove any identification of SNA over the property identified in the submission.	Reject
S440.002	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The forest remnants within 6969 SH1 include mature kahikatea with a distinctive, and within these remnants, unique ecology habitat generated through their rooting behaviour in now drained shrinking wetland and should be included in an SNA.	Insert SNA protection for the stands of vegetation on 6969 SH1 identified in the submission. In the absence of that status, I withdraw my agreement, identifying the inconsistencies inherent to the application of such status.	Reject
S440.003	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The SNA designation is imposed 'for public good'. "Consumer pays" is the capitalist principle invoked. In fairness and all reasonableness therefore, owners of SNA designated property must have rates relief or other appropriate funding of those SNA areas.	Include mechanism for rates relief, or a funding arrangement, in those areas designated as SNA	Reject
S477.021	Te Waka Pupuri Putea Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	As Tangata Whenua, we do not support a process of identification, assessment and classification of Significant Natural Areas ("SNAs") that impede Māori landowners use of whenua considering that state of Māori land more generally. Whenua Māori through the process of identification, assessment and classification of will be	Delete any provisions applying to 'significant natural areas' that may prejudice the administration of Māori land.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				unduly imposed upon as Māori landowners are significant proprietors of land that remains underdeveloped and in a natural state. As, Tangata Tiriti, any prejudicial administration of Māori land will be assessed contextually, and the upholding of or breaching of rights conferred under Te Tiriti o Waitangi will be approached accordingly at any relevant level of government. We understand that the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity will influence how SNAs are administered and as such will be submitting on these legislative developments also.		
S486.007	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FN2100 refers to "building high trust collaborative relationship with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their right to protect flora and fauna." The Purpose section states that the PDP helps Council achieve the outcomes of FN2100, but the PDP makes no other reference to supporting tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods. The PDP should be amended as indicated.	Amend the PDP to implement FN2100 by indicating support for kaitiaki through non-regulatory methods, including financial support and involving tāngata whenua in decision-making around protection of flora and fauna.	Accept in part
S486.008	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FN2100 refers to "building high trust collaborative relationship with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their right to protect flora and fauna." The Purpose section states that the PDP helps Council achieve the outcomes of FN2100, but the PDP makes no other reference to supporting tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods. The PDP should be amended as indicated.	Amend the PDP to implement FN2100 by indicating support for kaitiaki through non-regulatory methods, including financial support and involving tāngata whenua in decision-making around protection of flora and fauna.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S546.001	Ian Diarmid Palmer	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The reference June 2022 exposure draft NPSIB is substantially different to the November 2019 draft NPSIB and if the SNA aspects of the PDP are to be based on any draft NPSIB, it should clearly be the most recent one promulgated by Government. As of today, it remains unclear what if any NPSIB will be formally adopted by Government and if one is adopted when that might occur. Given the long gestation period so far for the formulation of a NPSIB, and the associated controversial nature of the subject matter, it is reasonable to assume a NPSIB will not be adopted any time soon and may well not be adopted prior to the Next General Election, after which a change of Government could set the policy development on an entirely different course. The FNDC has decided not to include the SNA maps that appeared in the draft PDP as an overlay in the Notified PDP. This lead to ambiguity and lack of transparency as to what land the policy and rules in the PDP is intended to apply to. If the FNDC's intention is to apply the PDP's SNA policy and rules to RC applications concerning land that is the subject of the withdrawn SNA maps, then SNA maps must be included as an overlay to the PDP. However, in so far as the SNA maps that appeared in the draft PDP were invalid, inaccurate or inappropriate in any way (as alleged by parties including myself who made submissions in this regard as part of FNDC's consultation of the draft PDP) these issues must be fully addressed and the maps updated accordingly before being included as the SNA overlay in the PDP.	Delete all references to Significant Natural Areas (SNA) from the PDP. If not adhered to then, include Significant Natural Area maps as an overlay in the PDP, but only after completing a thorough process of validating such maps including addressing any alleged invalidities, in accuracies or inappropriateness of any SNA maps intended to be used as part of SNA Overlay in the PDP	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S546.002	Ian Diarmid Palmer	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The reference June 2022 exposure draft NPSIB is substantially different to the November 2019 draft NPSIB and if the SNA aspects of the PDP are to be based on any draft NPSIB, it should clearly be the most recent one promulgated by Government. As of today, it remains unclear what if any NPSIB will be formally adopted by Government and if one is adopted when that might occur. Given the long gestation period so far for the formulation of a NPSIB, and the associated controversial nature of the subject matter, it is reasonable to assume a NPSIB will not be adopted any time soon and may well not be adopted prior to the Next General Election, after which a change of Government could set the policy development on an entirely different course. The FNDC has decided not to include the SNA maps that appeared in the draft PDP as an overlay in the Notified PDP. This lead to ambiguity and lack of transparency as to what land the policy and rules in the PDP is intended to apply to. If the FNDC's intention is to apply the PDP's SNA policy and rules to RC applications concerning land that is the subject of the withdrawn SNA maps, then SNA maps must be included as an overlay to the PDP. However, in so far as the SNA maps that appeared in the draft PDP were invalid, inaccurate or inappropriate in any way (as alleged by parties including myself who made submissions in this regard as part of FNDC's consultation of the draft PDP) these issues must be fully addressed and the maps updated accordingly before being included as the SNA overlay in the PDP.	Delete all references to Significant Natural Areas (SNA) from the PDP. If not adhered to then, include Significant Natural Area maps as an overlay in the PDP, but only after completing a thorough process of validating such maps including addressing any alleged invalidities, in accuracies or inappropriateness of any SNA maps intended to be used as part of SNA Overlay in the PDP.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S466.002	Leonie Exel and Arthur Prentice	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Dogs have been family members, best friends, counsellors, guides, protectors, workmates, and farm workers for centuries. Their inestimable value to human society generally cannot be in question. I support effective environmental measures and controls being put in place to protect our flora and fauna, but limiting dog ownership as a theoretical means of achieving this is unscientific, random, and inevitably self-defeating. It is cutting off your nose to spite your face: attempting to improve matters by making them much, much worse. I do not accept by either justice or logic that FNDC has a pre-emptive right to ban or restrict anyone from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. Cars might be said to inflict a far more significant and regular toll on kiwis, for example, but nobody would accept a like authority having the right to ban responsible drivers from owning and driving cars on that basis. There is passion but no logic in this position. This position has resulted in unintended consequences, such as: - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing requirements), - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed, - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs, - decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, - lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to live in more and more townships. There is also issues creating a break down in trust between Council management and the dog loving community, which are detailed in the BOI Watch dog submission.		
S468.001	Stephanie Lane	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FNDC decisions on consenting issues appear to indicate the District Plan provisions are being overridden by practice notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or the district, and raises questions about the statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, which also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district.		
S390.017	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The submitter considers that the Purpose section of the district plan, which states that the plan helps council achieve the outcomes of Far North 2100 however, the plan makes no other reference to supporting tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods. Far North 2100 refers to "building high trust collaborative relationship with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their right to protect flora and fauna."	Amend the PDP to implement Far North 2100 by indicating support for kaitiaki through non-regulatory methods, including financial support and involving tāngata whenua in decision-making around protection of flora and fauna.	Accept in part
S573.001	Te Kawariki me Te Wānanga o Te Rangi Aniwanawa	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	All Iwi involved with Te Kahu o Taonui criticise the FNDC for breaching the statutory consultation obligations under Schedule 1, clause 3(d) of the RMA by not properly consulting over its development of the annual plan. That the Maori Ward councillors work alongside Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC boundaries to develop a Mana Whakahono a Rohe Agreement that strengthens the rangatiratanga and influence of Twi and HapO in local government and the management of te taiao as outlined in section 33 of Resource Management Act . That Iwi/ HapO plans sit parallel alongside FNDC Annual plans in 2023 onwards. That the task of FNDC is to stop the alienation of remaining Maori lands ,	Delete all Significant Natural Areas from the Plan (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				abandoned Maori lands. That all SNAs be removed from the FNDC annual plan. That the Maori Ward Councillors broker, link and network with many agencies to bring about necessary improvement works for Iwi (as listed p41) , hapu and Maori Social Service agencies. That the Maori Ward Councillors consult with Iwi, Hapu and Ropu Maori within FNDC to confirm 4 takiwa for Maori ward councillors to manaaki/ mahi tahi in dealings with the FNDC. That the Maori Ward Councillors engage with Maori in four designated takiwa in a 8 months trial period, before final consultation Matariki 2023. That 200 homes be built in the next 3 years for struggling whanau . That all marae as public event centres have 500m tar seal either side of the marae . That Councillors seek funding to train tertiary students to develop resource consents for the FNDC. That Maori and local contractors be given opportunities to submit tenders for Council projects.		
S157.002	Tane's Tree Trust - Northland Totara Working Group	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	It is critical that sustainable indigenous forestry activities are not subject to unnecessary additional, costly and uncertain resource management consenting processes required by the District Plan. In contrast, appropriate sustainable indigenous forest management activities under the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) approved 'Sustainable Forest Management Plans' (SFMPs) need to be encouraged, supported, and explicitly provided for to ensure the following: 1. Harvests under MPI approved provisions of Part 3A of the Forests Act (e.g. SFMPs) are attributed permitted activity status throughout the District - including within Significant Natural Areas and areas designated as Outstanding Landscapes. 2. Sustainable indigenous forestry is	Amend the District Plan to allow harvests under Ministry of Primary Industries' approved sustainable forest management plans and permits as permitted activities in all rural zones, Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				supported and encouraged as an example of an appropriate nature-based land use activity and recognised as a form of formal protection for areas of native forest, including within Significant Natural Areas.			
FS46.1	Paul Quinlan		Support	Clause 3.10 (6) (e) of The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), recently approved by government, makes it clear that harvests under MPI approved SFM Permits and Plans (under the provisions of the Forests Act) should be considered acceptable in SNAs. It follows that they should be treated as Permitted Activities in District Plans.	Allow		Accept in part
FS46.4	Paul Quinlan		Support	The SFM Plan and SFM Permit provisions of part 3A of the Forests Act require comment but the Department of Conservation as part of the process. This enables site specific concerns about biodiversity matters or conditions to be incorporated into the details of any approved SFM Plan or Permit. Moreover, the level of protection of forest values including biodiversity under the requirements of SFM Plans is greater than set out in the NPSIB. Therefore, matters of biodiversity management will have been well considered and addressed in any MPI approved SFM Plan or Permit under the Forests Act. Requiring a further process under the RMA would be a double up and at a lesser level of rigor.	Allow		Accept in part
FS46.5	Paul Quinlan		Support	The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB) specifically addresses harvests under MPI approved SFMPs and acknowledges that they are consistent with maintaining biodiversity. Therefore, not to allow this submission would be inconsistent with the NPSIB, and or cast aspersions on the integrity of the govt ministries involved with administering it.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS404.009	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The D-G is concerned that permitted activity or other rules of this nature would rely on the assessment of effects on indigenous biodiversity that has been undertaken under a plan or permit under the Forests Act 1949. The plans or permits are approved or issued by the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI). When MPI consider these plans and permits, the consideration over what is 'sustainable' under the Forests Act 1949, is different to 'sustainable management' under the Resource Management Act. This means that when MPI are considering any permit or plan, the framework for decision making is different to what should be considered under the RMA. It is inappropriate to incorporate this different assessment framework in the district plan.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S487.001	Tupou Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Proposed Plan is a strong disincentive to reforestation using native species. Essentially, under the Proposed Plan, if you plant native vegetation on your property then your future options become extremely restricted. In effect, as significant loss of property rights. Our vision for our hill country farm property within the FNDC area is to rationalise land use for food and wool production on the better land and to apply the class 6 & 7 land, which is the majority of the property, to the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity. Essentially this means reforestation of the majority of the property using a range of native species and committed, on-going pest control. However, if we are successful in achieving our goal, then the provisions of the Proposed Plan could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities. The rugged topography means that seeking certification with MPI as a Sustainably Managed Indigenous Forest, at significant cost, is not really an	Insert a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) with the following provisions: The basis for a good definition for MIV already exists under the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme. That is, the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land: - first established after 31 December 1989. - Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007; - is or will be planted in species that can reach at least 5m in height when mature - has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare - The post-1989 forest land definition should be adjusted to: - exclude the minimum size provision - include created wetlands - Pest and weed control is required - MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure). - Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities. - Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities. - If any restrictions are required then as follows: - In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				option. In addition to creating indigenous vegetation, these areas could well grow to meet the criteria to be Significant Natural Areas, and consequently incur the even more restrictive provisions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming. A high-level goal is the encouragement of native flora and fauna whilst not locking in restrictions on future land use, including uses which we haven't even thought of yet. The best way to achieve this is to encourage the army of landowners, not penalise them for doing good by placing restrictions on the outcome of their toil.	Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m2, whichever is greater. - All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m2, whichever is greater. - Otherwise discretionary. An alternative to creating a new district-wide category of MIV would be to create a Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which adequately embraces and encourages what we are attempting to achieve for the property. An example of this is the poorly named Nature Preservation Zone in the Hastings District Council plan. Such a zone would allow (permitted activity) for: - Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads and tracks. - Enhancement of accommodation offerings - Subdivision that aligns with the nature conservation intentions of the zone Key requirements for the zone would include: - Pest control - Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. - All actions fit under an umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" A key issue is that Special Purpose Zone removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive controls.		
FS112.3	Carly McIlroy		Support in part	I support in part this submission. The Proposed Plan would result in a loss of property rights for those wanting to restore native ecosystems, as they could likely be deemed Significant Natural Areas in the future which would restrict further developments. A distinction between managed and natural indigenous vegetation should be categorised, with managed systems becoming Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV). A district wide MIV category should be implemented to allow those restoring areas of indigenous ecosystems, allowing for future developments to be carried out in these areas if there is still a net biodiversity gain.	Allow		Reject
FS24.34	Lynley Newport		Support in part	Interested in some of the concepts outlined in this submission but disagree that	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous vegetation planted before 1989 should be treated any differently from that planted after 1989. No scientific justification and simply used as an 'administrative cut off date'.			
FS28.002	Dr John L Craig		Support	The proposed FNDP is a strong disincentive to reforestation using native species. If you plant native vegetation on your property then your future options become extremely restricted resulting in significant loss of property rights. The provisions of the FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within reforestation areas or require resource consent for activities. In addition, reforestation using native species could result in areas eventually meeting the criteria of SNAs incurring even further restrictions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming. Provisions should encourage native flora and fauna whilst not placing restrictions on future land use.	Allow	Insert a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) which includes a definition of MIV that is: the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land, first established after 31 December 1989, Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007, is or will be planted in species that can reach at least 5m in height when mature, has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare. Insert post-1989 forest land definition to exclude the minimum size provision, include created wetlands, Pest and weed control is required, MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure), Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities, Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities. Amend post-1989 forest land definition (if restrictions are required) to provide for In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m2, whichever is greater, All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m2, whichever is greater, any other activity as a discretionary activity. Insert Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which provides for Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads, and tracks, Enhancement of accommodation offerings and Subdivision that aligns	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					with the nature conservation intentions of the zone as permitted activities, insert key requirements for this zone including pest control, Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified and All actions fit under an umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" (inferred).	
S487.003	Tupou Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Proposed Plan is a strong disincentive to reforestation using native species. Essentially, under the Proposed Plan, if you plant native vegetation on your property then your future options become extremely restricted. In effect, as significant loss of property rights. Our vision for our hill country farm property within the FNDC area is to rationalise land use for food and wool production on the better land and to apply the class 6 & 7 land, which is the majority of the property, to the twin crises of climate change and loss of biodiversity. Essentially this means reforestation of the majority of the property using a range of native species and committed, on-going pest control. However, if we are successful in achieving our goal, then the provisions of the Proposed Plan could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities. The rugged topography means that seeking certification with MPI as a Sustainably Managed Indigenous Forest, at significant cost, is not really an option. In addition to creating indigenous vegetation, these areas could well grow to meet the criteria to be Significant Natural Areas, and consequently incur the even more restrictive provisions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be	Insert a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) with the following provisions: The basis for a good definition for MIV already exists under the NZ Emissions Trading Scheme. That is, the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land: - first established after 31 December 1989. - Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007; - is or will be planted in species that can reach at least 5m in height when mature - has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare - The post-1989 forest land definition should be adjusted to: - exclude the minimum size provision - include created wetlands - Pest and weed control is required - MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure). - Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities. - Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities. - If any restrictions are required then as follows: - In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m², whichever is greater. - All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m², whichever is greater. - Otherwise discretionary.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming. A high-level goal is the encouragement of native flora and fauna whilst not locking in restrictions on future land use, including uses which we haven't even thought of yet. The best way to achieve this is to encourage the army of landowners, not penalise them for doing good by placing restrictions on the outcome of their toil.	An alternative to creating a new district-wide category of MIV would be to create a Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which adequately embraces and encourages what we are attempting to achieve for the property. An example of this is the poorly named Nature Preservation Zone in the Hastings District Council plan. Such a zone would allow (permitted activity) for: - Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads and tracks. - Enhancement of accommodation offerings - Subdivision that aligns with the nature conservation intentions of the zone Key requirements for the zone would include: - Pest control - Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. - All actions fit under an umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" A key issue is that Special Purpose Zone removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive controls		
FS112.2	Carly McIlroy		Support in part	I support in part this submission. A special purpose zone should be implemented for Tupou, due to the extensive area that is planned to be restored. This will allow for large areas to be restored to native ecosystems as well as future developments to be carried out that will only enhance the area.	Allow		Reject
FS28.003	Dr John L Craig		Support	A special purpose zone should be implemented for Tupou, due to the extensive area that is planned to be restored. This will allow for large areas to be restored to native ecosystems as well as future developments to be carried out that will only enhance the area.	Allow	Insert a new category of Managed Indigenous Vegetation (MIV) which includes a definition of MIV that is: the land must be eligible as post-1989 forest land, first established after 31 December 1989, Wasn't forest land on 31 December 1989; or was forest land on 31 December 1989, but was deforested between 1 January 1990 and 31 December 2007, is or will be planted in species that can reach at least 5m in height when mature,	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					has/will have tree crown cover of more than 30% in each hectare. Insert post-1989 forest land definition to exclude the minimum size provision, include created wetlands, Pest and weed control is required, MIV cannot be included as SNA (possible exceptions with landowner agreement where the landowner receives some mitigation measure), Pruning, trimming, thinning are permitted activities, Clearance and any associated land disturbance are permitted activities. Amend post-1989 forest land definition (if restrictions are required) to provide for In Rural Production Zone or Treaty Settlement Land Overlay: if it does not exceed 20% of the MIV over a 3-year period; or 5,000 m2, whichever is greater, All other zones, if it does not exceed 10% of the MIV over a 5-year period; or up to 5,000 m2, whichever is greater, any other activity as a discretionary activity. Insert Special Purpose Zone for Tupou, which provides for Vegetation clearance to a certain level for buildings, roads, and tracks, Enhancement of accommodation offerings and Subdivision that aligns with the nature conservation intentions of the zone as permitted activities, insert key requirements for this zone including pest control, Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified and All actions fit under an umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" (inferred).	
S364.005	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The s32 reports have identified that it is effective and efficient to align the PDP approach with the expected policy direction and requirements of the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB). The NPSIB is anticipated to come into effect during the PDP further submissions and hearing process. For this reason, the PDP	Amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPSIB exposure draft. Specifically, but not limited to: - Protect SNAs and identified taonga on Māori lands inline with clause 3.18 of the NPSIB exposure draft. - Include objectives, policies, or methods in the PDP for managing the adverse effects of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should be reviewed and updated to be consistent with the NPSIB exposure draft.	new subdivision, use, and development on highly mobile fauna areas. Incorporate NPSIB Appendices 3 and 4 or like principles into the PDP. Update proposed Policy IB-P4 to require that any biodiversity offset, or biodiversity compensation be in accordance with these principles.		
FS93.10	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	Dog owners can ensure their dog stays under their control in a number of ways, one of which is to fence their property securely. This prevents their dog from wandering, which is the primary risk to kiwi from dogs. It is unreasonable to demand that a dog owner NOT fence their property, in case wildlife of various sort choose to walk through it. This is likely to have the opposite of the desired effect, which is protection of that wildlife. If an area is of such great importance to the survival of a particular species, do not develop it at all.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS176.4	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	The DP needs to be consistent with the NPS-IB not the consultation document. The NPS-IB has been gazetted and took effect from 4 August.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.13	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft is out of date (that draft now being replaced by the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity) and should be disallowed. Should the relief be inferred to mean the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, then this should be given effect to by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission, to ensure its clauses are properly implemented, including its principles of	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				partnership, transparency, access and consistency.			
FS68.14	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft is out of date (that draft now being replaced by the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity) and should be disallowed. Should the relief be inferred to mean the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, then this should be given effect to by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission, to ensure its clauses are properly implemented, including its principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.13	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPSIB exposure draft is out of date (that draft now being replaced by the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity) and should be disallowed. Should the relief be inferred to mean the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, then this should be given effect to by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission, to ensure its clauses are properly implemented, including its principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS85.2	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The inclusion of the rules, as suggested by the submitter, is unnecessary, as the NPS-IB should take precedence.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS108.9	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The DP should be consistent with the NPS-IB. Disallow submitters suggestions and ensure the DP is consistent with the NPS-IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS25.022	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	The submission refers to the exposure draft of the NPS-IB, which has been superseded. While some amendments may be appropriate to give effect to the NPS-IB within the scope of the FNDC and	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part, subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				submissions, it may not be possible to fully implement the NPS-IB given the FNDC and submissions predated the NPS-IB.			
FS446.007	Omata Estate		Oppose	Omata agrees that the Plan has to give effect to National Policy Statements however, as above, this plan process is too far advanced and to ensure there are no natural justice issues a separate plan change process is required.	Disallow	retain	Accept in part
FS66.14	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend the Plan to be consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft is out of date (that draft now being replaced by the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity) and should be disallowed. Should the relief be inferred to mean the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, then this should be given effect to by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission, to ensure its clauses are properly implemented, including its principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.15	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	Improved provisions are needed to implement s6(c) of the Resource Management Act and the National Policy Statement on Biodiversity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS547.008	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter agrees that the Plan has to give effect to National Policy Statements however, as above, this plan process is too far advanced and to ensure there are no natural justice issues a separate plan change process is required.	Disallow	Disallow	Accept in part
FS339.037	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Consistency with the NZSIB is required, noting it is now in force.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS393.023	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	a review of the Further Submitters property is already taking place.	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
FS548.081	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS548.082	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS305.009	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	The submitter agrees that the District Plan has to give effect to National Policy Statements however, the proposed district plan process is too far advanced and to ensure there are no natural justice issues a separate plan change process is required.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS325.018	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	The submission refers to the exposure draft of the NPS-IB, which has been superseded. While some amendments may be appropriate to give effect to the NPS-IB within the scope of the proposed district plan and submissions, it may not be possible to fully implement the NPS-IB given the proposed district plan and submissions predated the NPS-IB.	Allow in part	Allow the submission in part subject to appropriate wording and or any mapping changes.	Accept in part
FS570.1086	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
FS346.145	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
FS566.1100	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
FS569.1122	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
S468.002	Stephanie Lane	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Dogs have been family members, best friends, counsellors, guides, protectors, workmates, and farm workers for centuries. Their inestimable value to human society generally cannot be in question. I support effective environmental measures and controls being put in place to protect our flora and fauna, but limiting dog ownership as a theoretical means of achieving this is unscientific, random, and inevitably self-defeating. It is cutting off your nose to spite your face: attempting to improve matters by making them much, much worse. I do not accept by either justice or logic that FNDC has a pre-emptive right to ban or restrict anyone from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. Cars might be said to inflict a far more significant and regular toll on kiwis, for example, but nobody would accept a like authority having the right to ban responsible drivers from owning and driving cars on that basis. There is passion but no logic in this position. This position has resulted in unintended consequences, such as: - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing requirements), - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed, - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs, - decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, - lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to live in more and more townships. There is also issues creating a break down in trust between Council management and the dog loving community, which are detailed in the BOI Watch dog submission. On a personal note, there will be benefits in terms of walking and health, animal welfare, domestic violence, rental accommodation, tourism. It will also address hypocrisy and mistrust with council. Mandatory desexing is essential.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS93.19	Leonie M Exel		Support	Stephanie Lane is a former vet, dog fosterer for BOI Animal Rescue, and all round lovely, law-abiding person. Her knowledge of dog care and control is substantive. Please listen to her views - they are well-informed. She is also an environmentalist who would not recommend anything she considers might hurt indigenous biodiversity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.20	Leonie M Exel		Support	I agree with Stephanie's recommendations. Dog bans and restriction on numbers of dogs may have been 'well-intended' by past council managers, however they have failed to achieve the desired result, which was a reduction in wandering dogs leading to kiwi deaths. FNDC needs to increase funding for animal control officers to work in sensitive areas more closely, and those areas where wandering dogs are currently a problem. And please consider funding an external organisation for community education - dog owners are unlikely to trust a council staff member in this role. In addition, please consider support for and funding of de-sexing of dogs across the rohe.	Allow		Accept in part
FS88.87	Stephanie Lane		Support	I'm supporting my own submission! I appreciate there being a brief summary here of my original submission but it is hard to see and easily missed by others, being at the bottom of a generic BOI Watchdogs "reasons" summary. I'd also like to note, that because it is generic, it wasn't taken from my actual submission. There are words in this that I did not use. I would just like to add that as a personal recipient of FNDC anti-dog laws, I (and therefore others like me) am negatively impacted on an on-going, daily basis: • My mental health suffers from having to fix other people's stuff ups. I personally	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(and all the other rescuers and fosterers) pick up the pieces of people dumping their animals due to lack of rental homes that they can bring their animals with them to. I have to see the constant rehoming posts due to not being able to take their animals with them. It breaks my heart just as it breaks theirs. • I have troubled dogs living with me as a result of inadequate animal management (ie not desexing, abuse, neglect). This costs me (and other fosterers) my peace, time and money. • I have limited time and cannot afford to take the time to go for a walk without responsibly exercising my dogs at the same time, so due to dog bans on most public walks I am unable to enjoy the fantastic backyard of the Bay of Islands which is so unfair. I'd happily keep my dogs on leads where they couldn't possibly hurt kiwi. Heck, I'd even muzzle them! (Though that would be unnecessary). • Exercised and enriched dogs are happy dogs. Happy dogs don't cause as much destruction as unhappy bored dogs. We can't enrich our dogs' lives and our own with healthy safe walks in our own local bush areas with all these "No Dogs" rules. This reduces the physical and mental health of dog-loving people, and creates frustrated dogs who are much more likely to kill kiwi. • Having fostered a troubled teenage boy from a local family from Moerewa, I've seen close up his attitude to dogs and heard about his family's treatment of dogs. This boy has been damaged by family violence and has not been taught empathy, to animals or to humans. Under my care, he learned both to a degree. He started to learn how to understand/read dogs having			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				lived with them in a non-violent home. Had he had the opportunity to learn this while young, he would have learned empathy. Our young people need this to turn into good adults. I reiterate my point about the link of animal violence to domestic violence. • I want to tour Northland in my campervan. My dogs come for security and company. I could support tourism and local businesses while doing it. But I can't because my dogs can't come. • My choices to find a new home are getting less and less. I support certain genuine high kiwi zones, such as Doves Bay, having dog and cat free areas, but these should be minimised and not creep to cover more and more land. Some people are happy to live without dogs and cats and this can work well for them. I simply don't consider anything in that area and that's ok. Just don't make the majority of Northland excluded to me and everyone else who shares their home and family with animals. If kiwi are our priority, outright banning of dogs will not protect them. Other measures will, such as reducing subdivision in kiwi dense areas, keeping dogs on leads in kiwi present walkways, requiring homes in kiwi present areas to have adequate fencing, dogs inside at night (except when toileting), etc, mandatory desexing, will. We all want to protect our native icon and it can be done without taking away the rights of animal lovers and their animals.		
S343.001	Jillian Jane Kearney	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FNDC decisions on consenting issues appear to indicate the District Plan provisions are being overridden by practice notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the district, and raises questions about the statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, which also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district.			
FS93.23	Leonie M Exel		Support	• These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work! - Dog-bans over-regulate responsible dog owners, and under-regulate irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts. - Please use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly. • The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs. • When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time. • It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts.	Allow		Accept in part
FS88.19	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S343.002	Jillian Jane Kearney	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Dogs have been family members, best friends, counsellors, guides, protectors, workmates, and farm workers for centuries. Their inestimable value to human society generally cannot be in question. I support	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				effective environmental measures and controls being put in place to protect our flora and fauna, but limiting dog ownership as a theoretical means of achieving this is unscientific, random, and inevitably self-defeating. It is cutting off your nose to spite your face: attempting to improve matters by making them much, much worse. I do not accept by either justice or logic that FNDC has a pre-emptive right to ban or restrict anyone from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. Cars might be said to inflict a far more significant and regular toll on kiwis, for example, but nobody would accept a like authority having the right to ban responsible drivers from owning and driving cars on that basis. There is passion but no logic in this position. This position has resulted in unintended consequences, such as: - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				requirements), - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed, - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs, - decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, - lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to live in more and more townships. There is also issues creating a break down in trust between Council management and the dog loving community, which are detailed in the BOI Watch dog submission.			
FS93.24	Leonie M Exel		Support	Please! Allow our community to unite: • STOP the dog bans • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.20	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S457.001	Clare Williams	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FNDC decisions on consenting issues appear to indicate the District Plan provisions are being overridden by practice notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or the district, and raises questions about the statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, which also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district.	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)		Accept in part
FS93.31	Leonie M Exel		Support	Agree with this submission. Please! Allow our community to unite: • STOP the dog bans and restriction of numbers • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.23	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S527.014	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP currently provides for controls on domestic predators (such as dogs, cats, mustelids etc) in order to protect three indigenous species: kiwi, dotterel and brown teal. The Regional Policy Statement (Method 4.4.3(2)(b)) requires the DP to implement 'Controls on the introduction or keeping of species with recognised pest potential' as part of its implementation of RPS Policy 4.4.1.	Insert a provision similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to predation.		Accept
FS93.37	Leonie M Exel		Support	I support the inclusion of any and all wildlife, as long as that inclusion does not lead to dogs or cats being banned from living on any property in perpetuity.	Allow in part		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The bans don't work, and force us into an either/or position. Please think inclusively, stop the dog bans, and use evidence - driven means to reduce wandering dogs.			
FS88.72	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	All threatened species should be protected. This should include good dog management, not bans.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS277.43	Jenny Collison		Support	There are very few native birds in Kerikeri. They need protection	Allow		Accept
FS566.1876	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S527.009	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards).	Amend the PDP to actively protect areas where kiwi or indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under NZ Threat Classification System) are present. For example, landowners should be required to contact DOC for a trained detection dog or other investigation, and agree with DOC a clear plan to protect vulnerable species, before any vegetation clearance starts. Where appropriate, clearance should be staggered over time, so that indigenous species are able to move to shelter. Insert an appendix to the PDP to include, or refer to, a protocol that sets out guiding principles and procedures.		Accept in part
FS176.6	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	The provisions of the NES-PF and the NPS-IB provide an appropriate national framework for managing vegetation clearance. The submitter seeks restrictions that are onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS108.11	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	There are provisions set out in the NES-PF and NPS-IB on how to deal with indigenous biodiversity and clearance in a plantation forest. Further restrictions are onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.71	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS277.42	Jenny Collison		Support	I support Vision Kerikeri submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.1871	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards). PDP rules should actively protect areas where kiwi or indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under NZ Threat Classification System) are present. For example, landowners should be required to contact DOC for a trained detection dog or other investigation, and agree with DOC a clear plan to protect vulnerable species,	Amend policies and rules relating to vegetation clearance as are too permissive and do not provide sufficient protection for even the minimal maintenance of (a) indigenous vegetation and ecosystems, (b) kiwi and indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZ Threat Classification System), (c) freshwater, and (d) other ecological, landscape, character and amenity values.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				before any vegetation clearance starts. Where appropriate, clearance should be staggered over time, so that indigenous species are able to move to shelter. An appendix to the PDP could include, or refer to, a protocol that sets out guiding principles and procedures.			
FS176.7	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	The NES-PF and the NPS-IB establish an appropriate regime for vegetation clearance that addresses the concerns raised. The submitter is seeking restrictions that are onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS108.12	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	There are provisions in the NES-PF and guidance under the NPS-IB on vegetation clearance in a plantation forest. There are also provision set out on protection of indigenous species. Further rules are onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS404.062	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1697	Vision Keriikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.612	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1724	Vision Keriikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S368.005	Far North District Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP is required to give effect to any National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Amend where necessary to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity		Accept in part
FS67.9	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by FNDC to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.			
FS155.11	Fiona King		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.10	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by FNDC to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.9	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by FNDC to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan,	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.			
FS25.038	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	While some amendments may be appropriate to give effect to the NPS-IB within the scope of the FNDC and submissions, it may not be possible to fully implement the NPS-IB given the FNDC and submissions predated the NPS-IB.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS446.009	Omata Estate		Oppose	Omata agrees that the Plan has to give effect to National Policy Statements however, as above, this plan process is too far advanced and to ensure there are no natural justice issues a separate plan change process may be required.	Disallow	retain	Accept in part
FS66.9	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by FNDC to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.			
FS372.007	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity must be given effect to.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS354.007	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks to amend the plan to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. The approach is supported but submitters need to be able to be involved in additional provisions.	Allow	Allow S368.005 but ensure adequate input for submitters.	Accept in part
FS325.019	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	While some amendments may be appropriate to give effect to the NPS-IB within the scope of the proposed district plan and submissions, it may not be possible to fully implement the NPS-IB given the proposed district plan and submissions predated the NPS-IB.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part subject to appropriate wording and any mapping changes.	Accept in part
S364.004	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity.	Amend all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules to insert matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity where appropriate and not already identified (inferred).		Accept in part
FS67.12	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules to insert matters of discretion/control for indigenous	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				biodiversity does not give proper effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, nor does it properly consider the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions or the risk of acting or not acting as required by s32 of the RMA 1991. The method proposed is a blunt instrument, which lacks the nuance required for proper environmental assessment, including a robust process for identifying the extent and values of the indigenous biodiversity. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, which should be by way of a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan.			
FS155.21	Fiona King		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.13	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules to insert matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity does not give proper effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, nor does it properly consider the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions or the risk of acting or not acting as required by s32 of the RMA 1991. The method proposed is a blunt instrument, which lacks the nuance required for proper environmental assessment, including a robust process for identifying the extent and values of the indigenous biodiversity. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, which should be by way of a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS69.12	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules to insert matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity does not give proper effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, nor does it properly consider the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions or the risk of acting or not acting as required by s32 of the RMA 1991. The method proposed is a blunt instrument, which lacks the nuance required for proper environmental assessment, including a robust process for identifying the extent and values of the indigenous biodiversity. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, which should be by way of a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS85.1	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is very open and there is no identification of each land use is captured by the rationale of the rule is trying to support. This should be avoided by the District Council when making rules, as too uncertain.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS25.125	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNA requires current mapping based on ground truthing and ecological assessment.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS446.006	Omata Estate		Oppose	Implementation of the NPS IB requires a thorough and robust planning process to ensure a clear and consistent direction is adopted throughout Northland and the Far North District. The current planning process (Proposed District Plan) is too far advanced. A separate plan change is required.	Disallow	retain	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS66.13	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by DOC to amend all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules to insert matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity does not give proper effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, nor does it properly consider the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions or the risk of acting or not acting as required by s32 of the RMA 1991. The method proposed is a blunt instrument, which lacks the nuance required for proper environmental assessment, including a robust process for identifying the extent and values of the indigenous biodiversity. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, which should be by way of a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.14	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	Improved provisions are needed to implement s6(c) of the Resource Management Act and the National Policy Statement on Biodiversity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS547.007	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	Implementation of the NPS IB requires a thorough and robust planning process to ensure a clear and consistent direction is adopted throughout Northland and the Far North District. The current planning process (Proposed District Plan) is too far advanced. A separate plan change is required.	Disallow	Disallow	Accept in part
FS339.036	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Area that qualify as significant should be treated as such, whether scheduled or not.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS548.080	Northland Federated		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.			
FS305.008	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	Implementation of the NPS IB requires a thorough and robust planning process to ensure a clear and consistent direction is adopted throughout Northland and the Far North District. The current planning process (Proposed District Plan) is too far advanced. A separate plan change is required.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS325.078	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT supports mapping for SNA's to provide clarity and relative certainty in the Plan so long as these areas are correctly mapped and the mapping is based on current ground truthing and ecological assessment. Mapping should also be cognisant of existing and proposed zoning and the need to achieve the overall strategic direction for the District.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.1085	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
FS346.144	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
FS566.1099	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
FS569.1121	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
S429.001	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Policies and rules relating to vegetation clearance are too permissive and do not provide sufficient protection for even the minimal maintenance of (a) indigenous	Revise the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as - - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				vegetation and ecosystems, (b) kiwi and indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZ Threat Classification System), (c) freshwater, and (d) other ecological, landscape, character and amenity values.	land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present. Additional specific provisions include - - Rules for banning potential predator pets (dogs, cats, mustelids, etc) from areas where kiwi or other at risk/threatened species are present and vulnerable to these predators (e.g. shore birds such as dotterel, wetland birds such as bittern and dabchick, at-risk lizards, and other animals). - Consent conditions should require fencing on the boundaries of public land, such as esplanade reserve, and around areas of wetlands and waterways. - Consent conditions for areas of significant vegetation/habitat etc. should set high standards of protection for indigenous vegetation, kiwi, at risk/threatened species and biodiversity, including appropriate types of fencing, predator control, protection and restoration of native vegetation, weed control, restrictions on planting exotic vegetation, etc. Covenants should be legally binding in perpetuity and should include provisions for monitoring implementation and enforcement. - Fencing needs to be appropriate for vulnerable species in the area, for example, fencing that allows free movement of kiwi; or in other cases fencing to stop dogs entering a kiwi area. - Signage to help protect kiwi and other vulnerable species, such as wetland species, shore birds.	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					- Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be suitable for nocturnal wildlife, such as kiwi, and dark-sky-friendly (certified to minimise glare, reduce light trespass and protect the visibility of stars).		
FS67.14	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.59	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the NPS:IB	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.15	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.61	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Does not give effect to the NPS:IB	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.14	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.			
FS446.0010	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in principle subject to appropriate wording.	Allow in part	amend the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as- - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present.	Accept in part
FS66.15	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.			
FS66.80	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the NPS:IB	Disallow		Accept in part
S429.002	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Policies and rules relating to vegetation clearance are too permissive and do not provide sufficient protection for even the minimal maintenance of (a) indigenous vegetation and ecosystems, (b) kiwi and indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZ Threat Classification System), (c) freshwater, and (d) other ecological, landscape, character and amenity values.	Revise the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as - - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present. Additional specific provisions include -		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					- Rules for banning potential predator pets (dogs, cats, mustelids, etc) from areas where kiwi or other at risk/threatened species are present and vulnerable to these predators (e.g. shore birds such as dotterel, wetland birds such as bittern and dabchick, at-risk lizards, and other animals). - Consent conditions should require fencing on the boundaries of public land, such as esplanade reserve, and around areas of wetlands and waterways. - Consent conditions for areas of significant vegetation/habitat etc. should set high standards of protection for indigenous vegetation, kiwi, at risk/threatened species and biodiversity, including appropriate types of fencing, predator control, protection and restoration of native vegetation, weed control, restrictions on planting exotic vegetation, etc. Covenants should be legally binding in perpetuity and should include provisions for monitoring implementation and enforcement. - Fencing needs to be appropriate for vulnerable species in the area, for example, fencing that allows free movement of kiwi; or in other cases fencing to stop dogs entering a kiwi area. - Signage to help protect kiwi and other vulnerable species, such as wetland species, shore birds. - Street lights for subdivisions/developments should be suitable for nocturnal wildlife, such as kiwi, and dark-sky-friendly (certified to minimise glare, reduce light trespass and protect the visibility of stars).		
FS67.15	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				• Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.			
FS68.16	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.15	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS446.011	Omata Estate		Support in part	Support in principle subject to appropriate wording.	Allow in part	amend the provisions in all relevant chapters to address elements such as- - Policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6). - Policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3). - Adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). - Adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present.	
FS66.16	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	In general terms the indigenous vegetation clearance provisions in the Proposed Plan do not properly provide for normal and beneficial practices, and exemptions should be widened to include in all instances at least the following: • Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) • Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). • Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) • Maintenance of driveways and roads.	Disallow	Accept in part
S442.004	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	A large number of indigenous species are currently classed as threatened or at risk under the national NZ Threat Classification System. About 50 indigenous bird species have become extinct in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result of human activities. Many technical and policy reports have	Amend to adopt provisions specifically for maintaining and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk in NZTCS lists to be consistent with Regional Plan provisions on this topic (as required under s75 of RMA). Examples of relevant provisions are given in Box 1.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				noted that concerted action is required to prevent further deterioration. As noted above, RMA s31(1) applies to decision-making in relation to the use and development of land - District Council functions include 'the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of ... (iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity'. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland and Regional Plan contain a number of provisions that refer to aspects of biodiversity that are not about mapped SNAs (Box 1, below, provides examples). As noted above, under s75 of the RMA, the DP is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, and must avoid inconsistency with the Regional Plan. The DP can be more stringent than the RPS, but cannot be more relaxed.			
FS67.18	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	These provisions should be introduced bay way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan and only in accordance with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.19	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	These provisions should be introduced bay way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan and only in accordance with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.18	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	These provisions should be introduced bay way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan and only in accordance with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.29	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	These provisions should be introduced bay way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan and only in accordance with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS404.065	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1700	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.615	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1727	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S18.001	J L Hayes and Sons Ltd	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	I support SNAs as have kept a number on the farm. However they are only there because the farm has been built up since before 1900 from the original native bush, and the family has recognised their value. We don't need a regulation to keep them. (Property not identified).	Amend SNA provisions to have regard to the starting point that 1/3rd Department of Conservation land, 1/3rd Maori land and 1/3rd general title land (inferred)		Reject
FS155.6	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
S457.002	Clare Williams	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	Dogs have been family members, best friends, counsellors, guides, protectors, workmates, and farm workers for centuries. Their inestimable value to human society generally cannot be in question. I support effective environmental measures and controls being put in place to protect our flora and fauna, but limiting dog ownership as a theoretical means of achieving this is unscientific, random, and inevitably self-defeating. It is cutting off your nose to spite your face: attempting to improve matters by making them much, much worse. I do not accept by either justice or logic that FNDC has a pre-emptive right to ban or restrict anyone from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. Cars might be said to inflict a far more significant and regular toll on kiwis, for example, but nobody would accept a like authority having the right to ban responsible drivers from owning and	Accept the decisions requested in the Bay of Islands Watch dog submission - 354 (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				driving cars on that basis. There is passion but no logic in this position. This position has resulted in unintended consequences, such as: - negative economic impacts on our rohe in terms of housing and worker availability, - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets, - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs, and financially stressed - animal rescue services being unable to find land which is suitably zoned for them to base their operations, - fewer children living in homes which have dogs, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs, - increase in the number of dogs being dumped in the bush due to lack of available rentals, which has a potentially serious impact on native wildlife, - negative impact on real estate agents and developers, by reducing their potential buyer/tenant markets, even when they offer FNDC multiple means by which potential owners could control dogs effectively in high density kiwi areas (e.g. fencing, registration, micro-chipping, and de-sexing requirements), - reduction in tourism from family members who own dogs deciding not to travel North, as their parents live in areas where their dogs are not allowed, - reduction in tourism from dog-owners who are sight-seeing, as Northland's reputation for anti-dog attitudes grows, - less positive view of our district as a retirement area, - legal implications for FNDC should the community decide to challenge these restrictions/bans, - further decrease in (already fragile) trust between FNDC management and around half the community, who own dogs,		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- decrease in trust between dog owners and DOC, which in turn makes us wary of their advice about dogs and wildlife, lessened participation in local democracies, as residents give up trying to engage with a council they believe is just not listening, - creation of a false and destructive division between environmentalists and bird lovers, versus dog lovers, in our local communities which did not previously exist (we are all animal lovers), and - increasing anger from dog lovers about kiwi release programmes, which are seen as impinging on our right to live in more and more townships. There is also issues creating a break down in trust between Council management and the dog loving community, which are detailed in the BOI Watch dog submission.			
FS93.48	Leonie M Exel		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S91.009	PF Olsen Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) is imminent and is to be gazetted before the end of 2022. Without this national instrument (which will continue through the RMA reform under the National Planning Framework) the section of the plan is at risk of being inconsistent with the NPS-IB.	Do not progress the entire Ecosystems and Indigenous biodiversity section of the plan until the Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity has been gazetted.		Accept in part
FS108.3	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As said in the original submission until the NPS-IB has been released this chapter should be put on hold.	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.098	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
S466.001	Leonie Exel and Arthur Prentice	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	FNDC decisions on consenting issues appear to indicate the District Plan provisions are being overridden by practice notes. The content of the known notes is not reflected in the proposed DP, and the notes have not been disclosed. That prevents an accurate assessment of the impact of the District Plan on individuals or the district, and raises questions about the	Delete any objective, policy or rule that limits dog ownership in the district, and also dog ownership on land within Significant Natural Areas (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				statutory compliance and integrity of the consultation process and outcomes. In addition, there is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the clauses mentioned above, which also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district.			
FS88.39	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S527.037	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	We consider that the PDP should take on board the changes proposed by Forest & Bird that will provide necessary provisions for the natural environment.	Amend the PDP to take on board the changes proposed in the Forest & Bird submission.		Accept in part
FS88.73	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	As per my submissions on Forest & Birds submissions.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS277.45	Jenny Collison		Support	Forest and Bird suggestions should be adopted to protect our environments	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.1899	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S527.003	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP s32 report on this topic (p.3) recognises that the 'Council has obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna'. Te Mana o te Taiao sets out a strategic direction for the maintenance, protection and restoration of indigenous biodiversity in New Zealand for the next 30 years (2020-2050). Te Mana o te Taiao aims to stop the degradation of New Zealand's biodiversity and is coupled with an implementation plan which is still being developed. The Strategy includes an overall vision: "The mauri of nature is vibrant and vigorous" with five key outcomes to achieve by 2050: - - Ecosystems, from mountain tops to ocean depths, are thriving. - Indigenous species and their habitats across Aotearoa New Zealand and beyond are thriving. People's lives are enriched	Amend the provisions to provide the level of protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, NPS and RPS (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				through their connection with nature. - Treaty partners, whānau, hapū and iwi are exercising their full role as rangatira and kaitiaki. - Prosperity is intrinsically linked with a thriving biodiversity. The PDP's s32 report on ecosystems and biodiversity (p.12) considers that the proposed PDP provisions are in line with the overarching aim of Te Mana o te Taiao. We disagree with that opinion. The objectives of the anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity seek to maintain indigenous biodiversity, improve the integrated management of indigenous biodiversity, restore or enhance it where possible and recognise the role of landowners, communities and tangata whenua as stewards and kaitiaki of indigenous biodiversity. The RPS sets out a number of objectives/policies relating to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity - examples are shown in Box 1 below. Section 75(3)(c) of the RMA requires district plans to 'give effect' to any RPS. The PDP provisions do not provide the level of protection noted in the RMA and policies above.			
FS66.84	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The submission lacks specificity in its relief.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS566.1865	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S364.012	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Director-General supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Offset provisions, however, requests that the provisions are updated to be in line with the NPSIB exposure draft.	Insert the NPSIB exposure draft biodiversity offset and compensation principles into the District Plan, ideally within an appendix that can be referenced in relevant provisions.		Accept in part
FS339.040	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Principles pertaining to offsets and compensation are critical to proper implementation.	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
FS570.1093	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
FS346.152	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
FS566.1107	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
FS569.1129	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
S364.015	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Director-General supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Compensation provisions, however, requests that the provisions are updated to be in line with the NPSIB exposure draft.	Insert the NPSIB exposure draft biodiversity offset and compensation principles to the District Plan, ideally within an appendix that can be referenced in relevant provisions.		Accept in part
FS339.041	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Principles pertaining to offsets and compensation are critical to proper implementation.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1096	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
FS346.155	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
FS566.1110	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1132	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
S364.083	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment, and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree ("the kauri hygiene zone") can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.	Insert clear guidance in the Plan for the management of Kauri Dieback disease, such as laid out in the Thames Coromandel District Plan.		Reject
FS548.077	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1164	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
FS346.223	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
FS566.1178	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
FS569.1200	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
S431.167	John Andrew Riddell	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend all rules providing for vegetation clearance that do not specify an areal limit by adding, as the case may be, that the vegetation clearance is to be the minimum necessary		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.167	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
S442.002	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The PDP s32 report on this topic (p.3) recognises that the 'Council has obligations under section 6(c) of the RMA to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna'. The s32 report (p.16) also recognises that 'the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity' is a core function of territorial authorities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA'.	Amend policies/rules to control any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land, or protection of land, for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity (under s31 of RMA) and protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (RMA s6).		Accept in part
FS404.063	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1698	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.613	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1725	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S442.003	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Regional Policy Statement for Northland and Regional Plan contain a number of provisions that refer to aspects of biodiversity that are not about mapped SNAs (Box 1, below, provides examples). As noted above, under s75 of the RMA, the DP is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, and must avoid inconsistency with the Regional Plan. The DP can be more stringent than the RPS, but cannot be more relaxed. Disappointingly, the PDP provisions pay insufficient attention to RPS s4.4 regarding	Amend policies/rules that will give better effect to biodiversity/ecosystem provisions in the Regional Policy Statement (which became operative from May 2016) and ensure that the district plan implements RPS Policy 4.4.1 (as required by RPS Method 4.4.3).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'Maintaining and enhancing indigenous ecosystems and species' and 'indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk'. We support policies IB-P7 - IB-P9. However, these seem to be almost the only policies that aim to protect indigenous biodiversity, and the PDP lacks rules to implement policies.			
FS404.064	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1699	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.614	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1726	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S442.009	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	We consider that the DP should include Policy similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to this type of predation.	Amend PDP to include provisions for] signange to help protect kiwi and other vulnerable species, such as wetland species, shore birds.		Accept in part
FS404.070	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1705	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.620	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	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
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS569.1732	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S354.016	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Dogs are not pests.	Delete any section in the Plan which mentions dogs as pests (inferred)		Accept in part
FS570.1025	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
FS566.1039	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
FS569.1061	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
S354.017	The BOI Watchdogs	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The Plan should not restrict dog ownership and dogs to not impact adversely on biodiversity (inferred).	Delete any sections of the Plan which state the aim is to "Encourage and support active management of pest plants and animals" or "Require landowners to manage pets and pest species to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species."		Accept in part
FS570.1026	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
FS566.1040	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
FS569.1062	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
S364.082	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Kauri Dieback is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment, and vehicles. The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree ("the	Insert clear guidance in the Plan for the management of Kauri Dieback disease, such as laid out in the Thames Coromandel District Plan.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				kauri hygiene zone") can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.			
FS570.1163	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
FS346.222	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
FS566.1177	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
FS569.1199	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
S436.002	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Remaining wetlands and ponds change over time due to infilling from decaying vegetation, natural infilling from windblown soils and sand and from natural detritus. This is a natural evolutionary process that has occurred for millennia. However new wetlands are no longer being created through this natural process due to rivers and streams being forced to defined areas with stopbanks and river control works. Increased contaminants and the introduction of pest plants have resulted in the infilling of small lakes, ponds, rivers and wetlands and the loss of biodiversity. This result causes the loss of habitat for a huge range of species that require open water areas for feeding and breeding. Wetland maintenance, restoration and enhancement is therefore vital to address the loss and degradation of wetlands. Many wetlands have become reliant on beneficial human intervention to function. Such intervention can increase the extent and	Amend the Plan to enable indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity within wetlands when it is for wetland maintenance and restoration work		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				improve the biodiversity, condition and resilience of wetlands. Most wetlands have been impacted by surrounding land drainage and nutrient enrichment from runoff. Restoration and enhancement works may involve restoration planting, removal of unwanted plants, managing water inflows and outflows into wetlands within a defined range, removing sediment that accumulates also within a defined range, blocking drains and restoring buffers and ecological linkages, and creating habitat for native flora and fauna. The nature of the works may change over time, but it is always undertaken within limits or ranges, and with the health of the wetland in mind. It is essential that the Far North District Plan strikes the right balance between protection of wetlands and allowing restoration/enhancement activities to occur. Relying on the preservation of remnant wetlands alone, will be insufficient at preventing wetland degradation caused by anthropocentric alteration to natural ecosystem functioning. If the loss and degradation of wetlands in the Far North District is to be addressed, encouraging wetland restoration and enhancement is vital. The District Plan must therefore find a balance that allows for interventions that aim to minimise impacts, restore hydrological functionality where it has been compromised and create new wetlands in order to provide habitat for species that no longer have sufficient natural wetland habitat to meet their ecological requirements.			
FS570.1466	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
FS346.088	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS566.1480	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
FS569.1502	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.114	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Oppose	The PDP's s32 report on ecosystems and biodiversity (p.12) considers that the proposed PDP provisions are in line with the overarching aim of Te Mana o te Taiao. We disagree with that opinion	Amend PDP to be in line with the overarching aim of the Te Mana o te Taiao		Accept in part
FS570.2002	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2016	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2038	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.178	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We share many of the concerns raised in Forest & Bird's submission on the PDP, and we consider that the PDP should take on board their comments	Amend Plan to give effect to relief sought in the Forest & Bird submission (511),		Accept in part
FS570.2066	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2080	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2102	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S486.047	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Purpose	Oppose	FN2100 refers to "building high trust collaborative relationship with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their right to protect flora and fauna." The Purpose section states that the PDP helps Council achieve the outcomes of FN2100, but the PDP makes no other	Amend the PDP to implement FN2100 by indicating support for kaitiaki through non-regulatory methods, including financial support and involving tāngata whenua in decision-making around protection of flora and fauna.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reference to supporting tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods. The PDP should be amended as indicated.		
S486.050	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa	Purpose	Oppose	Te Rūnanga o Whaingaroa supports "building high trust collaborative relationships with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their inherent right as mana whenua to protect flora and fauna." However, there is no other reference, implementation or method to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect their natural resources that include flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods.	Amend to implement non-regulatory methods that support iwi and hapū as kaitiaki that includes but not limited to, financial resourcing and decision-making ability.	Accept in part
S390.037	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Purpose	Oppose	The submitter supports "building high trust collaborative relationships with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their inherent right as mana whenua to protect flora and fauna." However, there is no other reference, implementation or method to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect their natural resources that include flora and fauna. Instead, it takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods.	Amend the plan to provide for non-regulatory methods that support iwi and hapū as kaitiaki which includes but is not limited to, financial resourcing and decision-making ability.	Accept in part
S498.038	Te Rūnanga Ā Iwi O Ngapuhi	Purpose	Oppose	The submitter supports "building high trust collaborative relationships with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. This aims to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki and their inherent right as mana whenua to protect flora and fauna." However, there is no other reference, implementation or method to support tāngata whenua as kaitiaki to protect their natural resources that include flora and fauna. Instead, it	Amend the plan to provide for non-regulatory methods that support iwi and hapū as kaitiaki which includes but is not limited to, financial resourcing and decision-making ability.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods.			
FS151.80	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.206	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that provisions are consistent with Treaty principles and recognise and provide for Māori interests, including (but not limited to) appropriate economic development of their land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought to the extent consistent with our primary submission	Accept in part
S390.005	Te Runanga o Ngai Takoto Trust	Purpose	Oppose	The submitter considers that the Purpose section states that the PDP helps Council achieve the outcomes of FN2100, but then makes no other reference to supporting tāngata whenua as kaitiaki. FN2100 refers to "building high trust collaborative relationship with iwi and hapū who have aspirations to protect indigenous flora and fauna. However, the PDP takes a purely regulatory approach, to the exclusion of non-regulatory methods.	Amend the PDP to implement FN2100 by indicating support for kaitiaki through non-regulatory methods, including financial support and involving tāngata whenua in decision-making around protection of flora and fauna.		Accept in part
FS339.012	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Taking an inclusive and integrated approach to managing flora and fauna and providing resourcing to tangata whenua will assist with realising "high trust collaborative" relationships.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S358.039	Leah Frieling	Approach to Integrated Management	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the Council withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, Objectives IB-O1 and SUB-O2, Policies IB-P1 and SUB-P8, and Rules IB-R4 and SUB-R17 have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Under this method, ALL bush is subject to SNA rules unless the owner (at their own expense) can prove that it is not an SNA. Because the ratepayer-funded SNA mapping is no longer publicly available, these rules will now not only affect landowners who had push previously	Amend the provisions protecting significant natural areas to provide: - incentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - support and resources for landowners. The option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just the Reserves Act and QEII covenants. Make the significant natural areas mapping available publicly, as a resource, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				mapped as SNA in the 1990s, but also owners whose bush was NOT mapped as SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. By looking at historical performance and by the Council's own admittance, these "stick" methods are unnecessary to achieve the protection, enhancement and enhancement of SNAs. While previously covenants were done by consent notice and constituted "bush protection covenants", covenanting under the Reserves Act or QEII constitutes a loss of control of the land. This is significantly more than a simple bush protection covenant. This is a loss of property rights. Acknowledge that the ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA's in the District, and instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing (carrot instead of a stick). By setting strict and harsh rules that deny landowners the right to remain as stewards to their land, Council is in breach of Objectives IB-04 and IB-05 Delete Rule SUB-R17as this does not protect SNAs.			
FS88.24	Stephanie Lane		Support in part		Allow in part		Accept in part
S364.011	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	BIODIVERSITY OFFSETS	Support in part	The Director-General supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Offset provisions, however, requests that the provisions are updated to be in line with the NPSIB exposure draft.	Delete the definition of Biodiversity Offsets, inserting the corresponding definition found within the NPSIB exposure draft.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS339.038	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	The NZSIB provides clear definitions as to what constitutes a biodiversity offset, noting it is now in force.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1092	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
FS346.151	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
FS566.1106	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
FS569.1128	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
S511.001	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	BIODIVERSITY OFFSETS	Support	Clear definition Consistent with best practice and policy under the proposed plan	Retain definition		Accept in part
FS164.001	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.	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1572	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
FS566.1586	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
FS569.1608	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
S454.015	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	BIODIVERSITY OFFSETS	Not Stated	Transpower supports the inclusion of a definition of biodiversity offsets in the FNPDP as it will improve clarity for the reader. However, the definition, as notified includes a set of offsetting principles that is not a definition and would be better suited to inclusion in a policy, appendix or guidance material.	Amend the definition as follows: BIODIVERSITY OFFSETS are measurable outcomes resulting from actions designed to provide new positive effects to counter residual adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on indigenous biodiversity. ~~Biodiversity offsetting proposals must address the following principles:—~~ Offsetting measures compensate for residual adverse effects on biodiversity identified after adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated according to mitigation hierarchy;— Offsetting measures achieve biodiversity outcomes above and beyond results that would have occurred if the offset had not taken place. The design and implementation of an offset should be based on sound science and avoid displacing activities harmful to biodiversity to other locations;— That there is no net loss and preferably a net gain of biodiversity values;— Offsetting measures re-establish or protect the same type of ecosystem or habitat that is adversely		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					affected (like for like), unless an alternative ecosystem or habitat provides a significantly better biodiversity outcome; The offsetting measures should apply as close as possible to the site incurring the effect with benefit diminishing with distance; The offsetting measures last at least as long as the effects of the activity, but preferably in perpetuity and incorporate monitoring and evaluation to allow for adaptive management where appropriate; The delay between the loss of ecological values through development and the gain or maturation of biodiversity values through offsetting measures is minimised; Compliance with offsetting measures is secured, as far as possible; There are limits to what can be offset when affected biodiversity is irreplaceable or vulnerable. In such circumstances, offsetting cannot be considered as a means of dealing with adverse effects. Note: This definition should be read in conjunction with the definition for 'Environmental biodiversity compensation'.		
FS346.018	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support in part	Forest & Bird would be comfortable with the offsetting principles being placed in an Appendix, as long as the definition makes clear that the principles must be met for an action to qualify as an offset. Similarly, any plan provisions referring to biodiversity offsets must make clear that adherence to the principles is mandatory.	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
FS404.012	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The principles are aligned with Appendices 3 and 4 of the NPS-IB, and therefore warrant inclusion in the FNDP. The D-G accepts inclusion in a policy and/or appendices may be the more appropriate place but opposes their deletion from the definitions in the absence of such drafting	Disallow	disallow in part the original submission	Accept
S442.021	Kapiro Conservation Trust	BIODIVERSITY OFFSETS	Support	Clear definition Consistent with best practice and policy under the proposed plan.	Retain definition.		Accept in part
FS570.1717	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.632	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1744	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S364.014	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	ENVIRONMENTAL BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support in part	The Director-General supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Compensation provisions, however, requests that the provisions are updated to be in line with the NPSIB exposure draft.	Amend the definition of Biodiversity Biodiversity Compensation, inserting the corresponding definition found within the NPSIB exposure draft.		Accept in part
FS339.039	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	The NZSIB provides clear definitions as to what constitutes a biodiversity offset. As above, it is now in force.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1095	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
FS346.154	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1109	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
FS569.1131	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
S511.005	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	ENVIRONMENTAL BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	Clear definition Consistent with best practice and policy under the proposed plan	Retain, perhaps if anything it could be stipulated to make it abundantly clear that compensation occurs offsite. This will help ensure there is no confusion between whether this is mitigation of offsetting.		Accept in part
FS164.005	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
FS570.1576	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
FS566.1590	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
FS569.1612	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
S454.018	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	ENVIRONMENTAL BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Not Stated	Transpower supports the inclusion of a definition of biodiversity offsets in the FNPDP as it will improve clarity for the reader. However, the definition, as notified	Amend the definition as follows: ENVIRONMENTAL BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION consists of measurable outcomes resulting from actions designed to provide new positive effects to		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				includes a set of compensation principles that is not a definition and would be better suited to inclusion in a policy, appendix or guidance material.	counter residual adverse effects of subdivision, land use and development on indigenous biodiversity. ~~Environmental biodiversity compensation proposals must address the following principles:– The measures compensate for residual adverse effects on biodiversity after adverse effects have been avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset, according to the mitigation hierarchy;– The measures achieve biodiversity outcomes above and beyond results that would have occurred if the environmental biodiversity compensation had not taken place. The design and implementation should be based on sound science and avoid displacing activities harmful to biodiversity to other locations;– There is no net loss and preferably a net gain of biodiversity values;– Where the measures are unable to re-establish or protect the same type of ecosystem or habitat that is adversely affected (like-for-like), consider alternatives that demonstrate a better biodiversity outcome;– Where the benefit will diminish with distance, this should be taken into account when assessing the measure;– The measures last at least as long as the effects of the activity, but preferably in perpetuity, and incorporate monitoring and evaluation to allow for adaptive management where appropriate;– The delay between the loss~~	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					of ecological values through development and the gain or maturation of biodiversity values through the measures is minimised. Compliance with measures is secured as far as possible. There are limits as to what can be compensated when affected biodiversity is irreplaceable or vulnerable. In such circumstances environmental biodiversity compensation may not be appropriate as a means of dealing with adverse effects.		
FS346.019	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support in part	Forest & Bird would be comfortable with the compensation principles being placed in an Appendix, as long as the definition makes clear that the principles must be met for an action to qualify as compensation. Similarly, any plan provisions referring to biodiversity compensation must make clear that adherence to the principles is mandatory.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.054	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy also supports the amendment of this definition.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS404.015	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The principles are aligned with Appendices 3 and 4 of the NPS-IB, and therefore warrant inclusion in the FNDP. The D-G accepts inclusion in a policy and/or appendices may be the more appropriate place but opposes their deletion from the definitions in the absence of such drafting	Disallow	disallow in part the original submission	Accept
S442.025	Kapiro Conservation Trust	ENVIRONMENTAL BIODIVERSITY COMPENSATION	Support	Clear definition Consistent with best practice and policy under the proposed plan.	Retain, perhaps if anything it could be stipulated to make it abundantly clear that compensation occurs offsite. This will help ensure there is no confusion between whether this is mitigation of offsetting.		Accept in part
FS570.1721	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1722	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.636	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
S511.008	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NET GAIN	Neutral		Retain definition		Accept
FS164.008	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
FS570.1579	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
FS566.1593	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
FS569.1615	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
S364.016	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	NET GAIN	Support	The Director-General supports the definition of Net Gain.	Retain the definition of Net Gain		Accept
FS570.1097	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
FS346.156	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1111	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
FS569.1133	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
S442.028	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NET GAIN	Neutral	No reason stated.	Retain definition.		Accept
FS570.1724	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS346.639	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
S121.003	Lynley Newport	NO NET LOSS	Support in part	"Net Gain" and "No Net Loss". These two definitions don't operate on a level playing field. To achieve a net gain a person has to prove 'measurable' positive effects of actions. Yet there is no requirement to 'measure' net loss? The burden of proof should be equal, otherwise a party applying	Amend definition of "no net loss" to read: "means that the measurable positive effects of actions match any measurable loss of extent or values..."		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for something requiring to prove 'measurable' positive effects can simply have their application dismissed because Council can claim there will be a net loss without 'measurement' being required.			
FS67.20	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.21	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.20	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS172.207	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.78	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS66.36	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S511.009	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NO NET LOSS	Support in part	This definition generally reflects the NPS-FW. However, the NPS does not refer to the offset within the definition. The NPS-FW rather refers to the type of habitat.	Amend "Means the measurable positive effects of actions match any loss of extent or values over space and time, taking into account the type, values function and location of the ecosystem type or the species type meant to be offset indigenous biodiversity offset " or some other words to this effect.		Reject
FS67.21	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.22	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.			
FS69.21	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.37	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS164.009	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
FS548.138	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The submitters proposed definition refers to the ecosystem type and species, this is inconsistent with Appendix 6 - Principles for aquatic offsetting of the National Policy Statement - Fresh Water which refers to the 'impact site'.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1580	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
FS566.1594	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
FS569.1616	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
S442.029	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NO NET LOSS	Support in part	This definition generally reflects the NPS-FW. However, the NPS does not refer to the offset within the definition. The NPS-FW rather refers to the type of habitat.	Amend "Means the measurable positive effects of actions match any loss of extent or values over space and time, taking into account the type, values function and location of the ecosystem type or the species type meant to be offset ~~indigenous biodiversity~~ ~~offset~~ " or some other words to this effect.		Reject
FS67.22	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.23	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.22	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.38	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Only amendments consistent with the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be allowed to this definition and introduced by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.1725	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.640	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
S442.147	Kapiro Conservation Trust	REMNANT FOREST	Support in part	The definition of "remnant forest" needs refining.	Amend the definition of "remnant forest" (from "means any indigenous natural area which has never been clear-felled") to recognise a wider range of relevant		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					natural areas, including indigenous forest that has been in place for a minimum number of years. The current definition could include indigenous natural areas of duneland, or coastal cliff vegetation.		
FS534.003	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	WBFL prefers the more focussed definition of this term as notified. WBFL is conscious that an overly broad revision of the definition could produce inadvertent outcomes, such as mature indigenous landscaping being classed as 'remnant forest' and consequently being made subject to more restrictive vegetation clearance requirements e.g., Rule IB-R4(2)(i).	Disallow	retain definition as notified	Accept
FS346.758	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
S451.003	Pacific Eco-Logic	REMANT FOREST	Support in part	The definition of "remnant forest" needs refining	Refine the definition of "remnant forest" (from "means any indigenous natural area which has never been clear-felled") to recognise a wider range of relevant natural areas, including indigenous forest that has been in place for a minimum number of years. The current definition could include indigenous natural areas of duneland, or coastal cliff vegetation		Reject
FS332.190	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
FS570.1508	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
FS566.1522	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
FS569.1544	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
S259.007	Nicole Wooster	SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support in part	The identification of SNA captures large areas of regeneration manuka and kanuka on the submitter's property. It is unclear how this is significant when in this location manuka and kanuka quickly establishes is land is not actively farmed. The vegetation and surrounding area is not near any DOC estate and due to surrounding areas being mostly clear of vegetation the area is heavily populated with possums and wild pigs. In reality, retaining such vegetation has resulted in significant damage to horticulture crops and paddocks due to pigs and possums. If the vegetation is not providing habitat for significant fauna, then we are unsure why these areas are SNAs as manuka and kanuka grow like weeds and is not at risk. Trimming would also be prevented so you could not even undertake activities to collect oil. Removal and regeneration is best for the industry as best products come from young trees. Due to changes to MPI classification of manuka rated honey, the value has dropped significantly and it is difficult to sell bulk honey as there is a lack of demand.	Amend SNA classification in submitter's location to not include areas of manuka and kanuka that do not contain any significant fauna. Different rules should apply to manuka and kanuka in this type of location due to this. If this is supported, the general vegetation clearancerules should also apply for a reasonable level of clearance allowed as a permitted activity for this type of situation.		Reject
FS172.277	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.7	Joe Carr		Support	I consider that, by Council changing the Plan as this submitter requires, it will allow for the reasonable use of land. Noting that almost 1/2 of the area of the Far North District has indigenous vegetation cover that has proven impracticable to manage for pests, AND noting that this change would go some way towards respecting the rangatiratanga of Maori and their land.	Allow		Reject
S511.016	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support		Retain		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand						
FS164.016	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
FS570.1587	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
FS566.1601	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
FS569.1623	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
S364.018	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support	The Director-General supports the definition of Significant Natural Area.	Retain the definition of Significant Natural Area		Reject
FS570.1099	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
FS346.158	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.			
FS566.1113	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
FS569.1135	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
S442.036	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Support	No reason stated.	Retain definition.		Reject
FS570.1732	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.647	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
S451.001	Pacific Eco-Logic	New Definition	Support in part	There is no definition of indigenous vegetation	Insert a definition for indigenous vegetation		Reject
FS332.188	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
FS570.1506	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
FS566.1520	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
FS569.1542	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
S451.002	Pacific Eco-Logic	New Definition	Support in part	There is no definition of suitably qualified and experienced ecologist	Insert a definition for suitably qualified and experienced ecologist		Reject
FS332.189	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
FS570.1507	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
FS566.1521	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
FS569.1543	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
S364.043	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	New Definition	Support in part	The Director-General supports Policy IB-P8, however, requests a definition be included in the District Plan to specify the meaning of "ecological district".	Insert definition for "ecological district".		Reject
FS570.1124	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
FS346.183	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
FS566.1138	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
FS569.1160	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
S442.145	Kapiro Conservation Trust	New Definition	Support in part	There is no definition of indigenous vegetation.	Insert a definition for indigenous vegetation.		Reject
FS346.756	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
S442.146	Kapiro Conservation Trust	New Definition	Support in part	There is no definition of suitably qualified and experienced ecologist.	Insert a definition for suitably qualified and experienced ecologist.		Reject
FS346.757	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
S333.013	P S Yates Family Trust	Overview	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of significant indigenous biodiversity (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified ~~in the District Plan~~ or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision~~ conditions may be placed on consents to ensure that the ecological		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting, maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners	
S168.020	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Overview	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of significant indigenous biodiversity ~~(Significant Natural Areas)~~ and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified in the District Plan or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision conditions may be placed on consents~~ to ensure that the ecological significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting, maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.013	The Shooting Box Limited	Overview	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of significant indigenous biodiversity (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified in the District Plan or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision conditions may be placed on consents~~ to ensure that the ecological significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting, maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners.	Accept in part
S396.021	Matauri X Incorporation	Overview	Oppose	Matauri X do not believe that the provisions of the aforementioned Chapter appropriately meet section 6(e) of the RMA 1991. The approach also does not promote kaitiakitanga and the entire chapter is rejected.	delete overview	Reject
S479.012	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	Overview	Support	The overview section of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter (EIB Chapter) does not contain or reflect the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki over existing forests/bush that exist on their whenua. As	Amend the overview to insert that FNDC undertake direct engagement with tangata whenua to better understand the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki, particularly how this is variable across whanau, hapū and iwi and amend the overview to recognise and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				detailed in the overview, there are large tracts of indigenous vegetation that exist of whenua Māori or land owned by Māori that are being managed and protected in accordance with Māori cultural values such as manaakitanga that is in line with tikanga and mātauranga Māori whereby tangata are exercising their role as kaitiaki. TKD are concerned that FNDC are proceeding with provisions that relate and reference Significant Natural Area's without undertaking the necessary engagement with tangata whenua. This is in direct conflict with the directions outlined in the exposure draft for the Natural and Built Environment Act and draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB).	provide for tangata whenua as kaitiaki, acknowledging that tikanga and mātauranga Māori play a central role in how tangatawhenua manage this resource.	
S167.013	Bentzen Farm Limited	Overview	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of significant indigenous biodiversity (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified in the District Plan or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision~~ conditions may be placed on consents to ensure that the ecological significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners.		
FS111.073	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision.	Allow	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.375	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
S442.018	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Overview	Support in part	RMA s74((1) states that: 'A territorial authority must prepare and change its district plan in accordance with ... a national policy statement'. District councils manage the margins of water bodies and the activities that can occur in these areas. Several parts of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) give national direction to district councils specifically.	Amend PDP to give effect to the NPS Freshwater Management 2020 in all relevant parts of the DP, including the Ecosystems and Biodiversity, and Natural Character Chapters.		Reject
FS404.079	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1714	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.629	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
FS569.1741	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S243.022	Matauri Trustee Limited	Overview	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to:	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	significant indigenous biodiversity (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified in the ~~District Plan~~ or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision~~ conditions may be placed on consents to ensure that the ecological significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting, maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners		
FS570.580	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
FS566.594	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
FS569.616	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
S222.020	Wendover Two Limited	Overview	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not	Amend the Overview as follows: Council has responsibilities under the RMA, the NZCPS and the RPS to identify and protect areas of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	significant indigenous biodiversity (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) and maintain indigenous biodiversity. Where ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified in the ~~District Plan~~ or through ecological assessments in accordance with the significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity there ~~will be greater control over land use and subdivision conditions may be placed on consents~~ to ensure that the ecological significance of these areas are protected. There may be tension between the public and ecological benefits in protecting, maintaining or enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the associated costs or restrictions to private and public (including Māori) landowners.	
S356.060	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Objectives	Support	not stated	Retain IB-O1-IB-O5 as notified	Accept in part
S396.022	Matauri X Incorporation	Objectives	Oppose	Matauri X do not believe that the provisions of the aforementioned Chapter appropriately meet section 6(e) of the RMA 1991. The approach also does not promote kaitiakitanga and the entire chapter is rejected.	delete objectives	Reject
S425.023	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast	Objectives	Oppose	Council have not mapped 'significant natural areas' (SNA) but have included reference to SNA in rules. PHTTCCT consider the absence of mapping SNA will	amend IB to: - Remove reference to significant natural areas in rules and rely on indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Cycle Trail Charitable Trust			result in implementation confusion and unnecessary cost to PHTTCCT in order to determine compliance.			
S425.026	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Objectives	Not Stated	Furthermore, the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	amend provisions to ensure that maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for		Accept
S529.115	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support	The PDP provisions do not provide the level of protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision	Amend objectives to reflect the level for protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision		Accept in part
FS67.35	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	With the the release of the the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity, that specifies how indigenous biodiversity should be maintained, and gives effect to the RMA. In turn, the Proposed Plan should give effect to the NPS by way of a Variation to the Plan, rather than through submissions, for the sake of partnership, transparency and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.37	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	With the the release of the the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity, that specifies how indigenous biodiversity should be maintained, and gives effect to the RMA. In turn, the Proposed Plan should give effect to the NPS by way of a Variation to the Plan, rather than through submissions, for the sake of partnership, transparency and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.36	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	With the the release of the the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity, that specifies how indigenous biodiversity should be maintained, and gives effect to the RMA. In turn, the Proposed Plan should give effect to the NPS by way of a Variation to the Plan, rather than through submissions, for the	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sake of partnership, transparency and consistency.			
FS66.55	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	With the the release of the the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity, that specifies how indigenous biodiversity should be maintained, and gives effect to the RMA. In turn, the Proposed Plan should give effect to the NPS by way of a Variation to the Plan, rather than through submissions, for the sake of partnership, transparency and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS570.2003	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2017	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2039	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S542.002	Marianna Fenn	Objectives	Support	Need to recognise the importance of encouraging landowners, occupiers and kaitiaki/guardians such as volunteer community groups to protect and enhance biodiversity To date my experience is that FNDC has not performed well in supporting and encouraging conservation initiatives	Insert new objective Landowners, land occupiers, and kaitiaki/guardians are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of the land they have an interest in.		Accept in part
FS88.41	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.2130	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
FS346.865	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 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
FS566.2144	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
FS569.2166	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
S542.003	Marianna Fenn	Objectives	Support	Ecosystem services are little acknowledged in this plan, yet they are essential to maintaining the life supporting capacity of the earth and mitigating the effects of climate change	Insert new objective The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are recognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience to the effects of climate change, maintaining fresh water quality, and enabling resilient food production systems.		Accept in part
FS88.42	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.2131	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
FS346.866	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2145	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
FS569.2167	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
S364.008	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Objectives	Not Stated	With the advent of myrtle rust, all Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa are currently considered threatened. The taxonomy and current threatened status of manuka and kanuka should be	Amend objectives, policies and rules as appropriate to recognise and implement measures to address and manage the increased threat status of myrtle rust for manuka and kanuka		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reflected and managed appropriately through objectives, policies and rules in the proposed plan. The relief sought is to be confirmed during the subsequent District Plan review stages once the 2022 version of the "Conservation status of New Zealand indigenous vascular plants" is available.			
FS323.3	Nicole Wooster		Oppose	Due to the scale of manuka / kanuka and the extent of areas not affected by myrtle rust it is overly restrictive to take such a precautionary approach	Disallow in part		Accept
FS548.083	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring. As well, manuka and kanuka cause significant tissues for farmers in that they can grow like a pest species and be very invasive in places.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1089	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
FS346.148	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
FS566.1103	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
FS569.1125	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S483.145	Top Energy Limited	Objectives	Not Stated	Top Energy acknowledges that objectives and policies for infrastructure within SNAs are located within the Infrastructure Chapter but seek to ensure that appropriate	Insert additional objectives that recognise the need for the location of new infrastructure within areas containing indigenous biodiversity where there is an operational and functional need, and any adverse		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of electricity infrastructure (in particular) is made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter in alignment with method 4.6.3, Policies 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 given that it also relates to indigenous vegetation clearance not captured as significant	effects are adequately managed. Insert additional objective that provides for the operation, maintenance repair and upgrading of infrastructure within areas of indigenous biodiversity.		
FS196.212	Joe Carr		Support	otherwise many areas would not have a RELIABLE electricity supply	Allow		Reject
FS111.074	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure should be made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Reject
FS346.072	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS345.196	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
S511.055	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Objectives	Support	Consider New Objectives to encourage landowners to protect, and enhance biodiversity	Insert Landowners are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of their land.		Accept in part
FS164.055	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.	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS354.108	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks an objective that landowners are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of their land. Recognition of landowners is supported.	Allow	Allow S511.055	Accept in part
FS570.1626	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
FS566.1640	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
FS569.1662	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
S511.056	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Objectives	Support	Ecosystem services are little acknowledged in this plan, yet they form a critical part of the environment	Insert The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are recognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience to the effects of climate change.		Accept in part
FS164.056	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.	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1627	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
FS566.1641	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
FS569.1663	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
S442.074	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support	Consider New Objectives to encourage landowners to protect, and enhance biodiversity.	Insert as new objective: "Landowners are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of their land".		Accept in part
FS570.1770	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.685	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
S442.075	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support	Ecosystem services are little acknowledged in this plan, yet they form a critical part of the environment.	Insert as new objective: "The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are reognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience to the effects of climate change".		Accept in part
FS570.1771	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.686	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	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
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S529.131	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Not Stated	A large number of indigenous species are currently classed as threatened or at risk under the national NZ Threat Classification System.4 About 50 indigenous bird species have become extinct in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result of human activities.5 Many technical and policy reports have noted that concerted action is required to prevent further deterioration. As noted above, RMA s31(1) applies to decision-making in relation to the use and development of land - District Council functions include 'the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of ... (iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity'. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland and Regional Plan contain a number of provisions that refer to aspects of biodiversity that are not about mapped SNAs (Box 1, below, provides examples). As noted above, under s75 of the RMA, the DP is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, and must avoid inconsistency with the Regional Plan. The DP can be more stringent than the RPS, but cannot be more relaxed	Amend the objectives to address RPS s4.4 regarding 'Maintaining and enhancing indigenous ecosystems and species' and 'indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk'.		Accept in part
FS570.2019	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2033	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2055	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.172	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support	Need to recognise the importance of encouraging landowners, occupiers and kaitiaki/guardians such as volunteer community groups to protect and enhance biodiversity. To date my experience is that	Insert new objective: Landowners, land occupiers, and kaitiaki/guardians are encouraged and supported to protect and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				FNDC has not performed well in supporting and encouraging conservation initiatives	enhance the biodiversity values of the land they have an interest in.		
FS346.783	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
S442.173	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support	Ecosystem services are little acknowledged in this plan, yet they are essential to maintaining the life supporting capacity of the earth and mitigating the effects of climate change.	Insert new objective The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are recognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience to the effects of climate change, maintaining fresh water quality, and enabling resilient food production systems.		Accept in part
FS346.784	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
S77.002	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S43.002	Andrea Vicki Thomas	IB-O1	Oppose	Submitter opposes the added expense to landowners to now engage a ecologist to prove that the bush on their property to establish that indigenous vegetation is not an SNA. Any help by Council will be at the rate payers expense having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. There has been an increase of 30% from when the district was last mapped for a similar purpose in the 1990's. This tells us that over 30 years our bush and forest has increased not decreased. Our land owners of the Far North have actually taken it upon themselves to increase these areas. They have fenced and restored wetlands, waterways and bush areas. What you are doing is creating a disincentive for landowners to do this work, not an incentive.	Amend to include mapping and identification of SNA's.	Accept in part
S49.002	Paul O'Connor	IB-O1	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps form the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging and ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.	Amend to assist land owners with the SNA identification process - thus encouraging them to protect SNA areas.	Accept in part
S41.003	Joel Vieviorka	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S163.006	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the Plan: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S377.003	Rua Hatu Trust	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S410.003	Kerry-Anne Smith	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S470.003	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S161.002	Shanon Garton	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S40.003	Martin John Yuretech	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S333.014	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-O1	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to:	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) are identified and protected for current and future generations	
S168.021	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) are identified and protected for current and future generations	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S348.005	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S187.014	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: - Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and - Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna ~~(Significant Natural Areas)~~ are identified and protected for current and future generations.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S395.003	Sean Jozef Vercammen	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S357.032	Sean Frieling	IB-O1	Oppose	Despite clear opposition to SNA mapping, provisions in the PDP have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowners to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA. None of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. Overall rural landowners have of their own volition increased not decreased the areas of SNA. Council is now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to restore wetlands, waterways and bush areas. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA in the District, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. Modify the approach to mapping and identification of SNA in accordance with the draft NPS for indigenous biodiversity. Insert incentives, not disincentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land. Amend the options for bush protection. Make SNA mapping available to the public.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S222.021	Wendover Two Limited	IB-O1	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) are identified and protected for current and future generations	Accept in part
S472.040	Michael Foy	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	• Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S547.003	LJ King Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the	• Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S544.003	Kelvin Richard Horsford	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S439.003	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that	Amend Objective IB-O1: to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to work in partnership with landowners given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		
S421.133	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	IB-O1	Support	Federated Farmers has a significant interest in this chapter of the proposed district plan. The preservation of indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity has and will continue to create tensions between private landowners, Iwi and Councils. The approach taken to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity is that landowners should it as a valuable asset rather than a hindrance. As part of this, it is important that activities such as lambing, calving, shelter, water supply and takes, fencing, access and works for access and fire breaks are permitted throughout the plan. Federated Farmers supports the Council removing the previous mapping that was included in the draft plan and the movement toward assessments being made where the permitted activity threshold has not been complied with.	Retain Objective IB-O1 or wording with similar effect		Accept in part
FS24.15	Lynley Newport		Oppose	The submitter may have not understood what the rule suite in this chapter does - it doesn't just require an assessment where a permitted activity threshold is breached, it requires an assessment (at landowners' cost) simply to prove permitted activity status. This is not fair or reasonable. If FNDC wants farmers to regard the bush	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and habitat on their property as an asset, then incentivise, don't regulate and punish.			
FS285.10	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	Submission points 133-136 to the extent that provision is made for limited removal of indigenous vegetation as a permitted activity for fire breaks, and permitted/consented building structures.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.1365	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
FS346.367	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
FS566.1379	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
FS569.1401	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
S541.003	Elbury Holdings	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	• Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS155.45	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S485.042	Elbury Holdings	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
FS155.46	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S519.042	Elbury Holdings	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
FS155.47	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S411.003	Roger Myles Smith	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
FS85.8	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS IB) has now been released and includes new SNA criteria to be applied nationally. It also requires that District Plans must identify all areas that meet SNA criteria, including the location and a map of the area.	Allow in part	Accept in part
S146.003	Trevor John Ashford	IB-01	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledgethat ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead offorcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are alreadydoing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAsunder the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership withlandowners - Provideincentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners toenhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Ifowners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protectioncovenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEIIcovenants. - MakeSNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS323.1	Nicole Wooster		Support	Council should work with landowners, who are providing for community benefit and reduced economic options. There should be the carrot and not just the stick applied	Allow		Accept in part
FS393.003	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.003	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of our land is in part within a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S167.014	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) are identified and protected for current and future generations		Accept in part
FS111.075	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision	Allow in part	allow in part	Accept in part
FS566.376	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S364.031	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-O1	Support in part	The Director-General supports Objective IB-O1, however requests an amendment to the wording to promote the enhancement of Significant Natural Areas.	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas) are identified ~~and~~ , protected, and enhanced for current and future generations.		Reject
FS548.087	Northland Federated		Oppose	The amendments sought will create unrealistic requirements for landowners in	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			terms of indigenous biodiversity and significant natural areas.			
FS354.109	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks the addition that SNA's are enhanced. The NPSIB does not seek enhancement so the policy is not consistent with the NPSIB.	Disallow	Disallow S364.031	Accept
FS534.020	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	The objective goes beyond the requirements of s6(c) RMA. A mandatory enhancement obligation leaves little scope for activities with a functional or operational need to intersect significant areas - as contemplated by IB-P5(b) - (d).	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept
FS570.1112	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
FS346.171	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
FS566.1126	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
FS569.1148	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
S243.023	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably	Amend Objective IB-O1 as follows: Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) are identified and protected for current and future generations		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.			
FS570.581	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
FS566.595	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
FS569.617	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
S160.014	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	IB-O1	Support	The submitter supports objective IB-01 and considers that it is important that SNAs are identified to provide certainty to landowners.	Retain objective IB-01 as it is written.		Accept in part
FS346.584	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
S569.003	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS348.234	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
S464.003	LJ King Ltd	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS566.1548	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S543.003	LJ King Limited	IB-O1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS566.2164	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
S163.007	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	IB-O2	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the Plan: • to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • to modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners • to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants • to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		Accept in part
S542.001	Marianna Fenn	IB-O2	Oppose	To use orientated and fails to give effect to the environmental bottom lines required by the RMA. Maintaining, protecting and enhancing natural assets will provide multiple benefits, including climate change mitigation, ecosystem services such as cleaner water and more reliable water supply, tourism attractions, and improvements in wellbeing for residents.	Amend by replacing with Indigenous biodiversity is managed to maintain its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities. The extent and diversity of indigenous biodiversity across the district is maintained, protected, and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					where possible enhanced		
Section 6.2.5	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- I do not support the deletion of 'the well-being of people and communities' from any part of this document. - The well-being of dog owners has been ignored by FNDC again and again. For over 20 years, our family members have been banned from land, in perpetuity, across this district - either by sub-division consent processes, or by covenants. - I had no chance to be consulted, and the elected council has not voted, to do this. - Indigenous biodiversity and pets can and do co-exist. If this becomes either/or, we will all lose - the dogs, and the wildlife - as it is unworkable.	Disallow		Accept
FS88.40	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	The welfare of dog owners has been ignored for far too long. I strongly support conservation efforts but the impact on the people who live in Northland should be considered and a win:win solution found.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2129	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
FS346.864	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2143	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
FS569.2165	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
S511.054	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-O2	Oppose	Fails to give effect to the environmental bottom lines approach required under the RMA. Human centric and use orientated. There will be threatened indigenous biodiversity which occurs outside areas identified as SNAs	Amend IB-O2 The extent and diversity of Indigenous biodiversity across the district is managed to maintained its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.		Reject
FS93.17	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- I do not support the deletion of "the social... well-being..." from any part of this document. - Social wellbeing is of national importance. This needs to be acknowledged, as the dog bans and restrictions via sub-division consents are affecting the wellbeing of our community NOW. - The wellbeing of dog owners is deeply and adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog. - Dog owners - overwhelmingly, research shows - consider their dogs to be a family member. - The well-being of dog owners has been ignored by FNDC again and again. For over 20 years, our family members have been banned from land, in perpetuity, across this district - either by sub-division consent processes, or by covenants. - I had no chance to be consulted, and the elected council has not voted, to ban or restrict dogs across the rohe. - Indigenous biodiversity and pets can and do co-exist. If this becomes either/or, we will all lose - the dogs, and the wildlife - as it is unworkable. - STOP the dog bans - INCREASE de-sexing - INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas - INCREASE community education	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.36	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.98	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.38	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.97	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.37	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.95	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS88.68	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	I do not support the deletion of "social well-being". It is the people who pay for the protection of SNAs and wild-life (via rates, taxes, rents, resource consent fees?). Surely we should be considered when making decisions that affect us. I'm personally am about to be an empty-nester. My children are all grown and leaving. My only company and security will be my animals. Depriving me of them would cause me huge distress. Banning them (and therefore me) is cruel and unnecessary. If it happens, I will leave Northland before I give up my family.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				I contribute to Northland: I obey the law I pick up rubbish from the side of the road I cut down noxious weeds (coming from the Queen's chain beside me) I pay rates and fuel tax I do voluntary work - for both people and animals I spend my money locally I plant native plants and grow flowers for the bees I'm pretty sure I do a lot more good for Northland than my dogs do harm. Why ban us?			
FS66.56	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.174	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS164.054	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
FS548.153	Northland Federated		Oppose	Federated Farmers believes that the notified version of IB-O2 is appropriate and	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			already encompasses what the submitter is asking for.			
FS404.093	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief is consistent with section 31 of the Act	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1625	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
FS566.1639	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
FS569.1661	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
S254.003	Heather Golley	IB-O2	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna, significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.			
FS93.22	Leonie M Exel		Support	I agree that all documents used to ban dogs and cats need to be at least referred to in the district plan, so that it is transparent and clear.	Allow		Reject
FS88.12	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS88.31	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS275.46	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	As fully outlined in the Reasons and in the Decision Requested of the original submitter - its point is well made. IB-P9 is also pertinent. The omission of all particulars of SNA's is regrettable and disentitles the territorial authority to take any action pursuant to any SNA or these policies.	Allow in part		Reject
S442.073	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-O2	Oppose	Fails to give effect to the environmental bottom lines approach required under the RMA. Human centric and use orientated. There will be threatened indigenous biodiversity which occurs outside areas identified as SNAs.	Amend IB-O2 The extent and diversity of Indigenous biodiversity across the district is managed to maintained its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.		Reject
FS67.37	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.99	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS68.39	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.38	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.39	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.96	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.57	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.175	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.1769	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.684	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
S442.171	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-O2	Oppose	To use orientated and fails to give effect to the environmental bottom lines required by the RMA. Maintaining, protecting and enhancing natural assets will provide multiple benefits, including climate change mitigation, ecosystem services such as cleaner water and more reliable water supply, tourism attractions, and improvements in wellbeing for residents.	Amend by replacing with Indigenous biodiversity is managed to maintain its extent and diversity in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities. The extent and diversity of indigenous biodiversity across		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the district is maintained, protected, and where possible enhanced		
FS67.38	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.100	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.40	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.98	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.99	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.97	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.58	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.176	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.782	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
S421.134	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	IB-O2	Support	Federated Farmers has a significant interest in this chapter of the proposed district plan. The preservation of indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity has and will continue to create tensions between private landowners, Iwi and Councils. The approach taken to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity is that landowners should it as a valuable asset rather than a hindrance. As part of this, it is important that activities such as lambing, calving, shelter, water supply and takes, fencing, access and works for access and fire breaks are permitted throughout the plan. Federated Farmers supports the Council removing the previous mapping that was included in the draft plan and the movement toward assessments being made where the permitted activity threshold has not been complied with.	Retain Objective IB-O2 or wording with similar effect		Accept
FS67.97	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Allow		Accept
FS68.96	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Allow		Accept
FS69.94	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Support	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future,	Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.			
FS66.173	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	Providing for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future, while maintaining indigenous biodiversity, is part of the objective of the NPS: IB at its clause 2.1.	Allow		Accept
FS570.1366	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
FS346.368	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
FS566.1380	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
FS569.1402	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
S364.032	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-O2	Support in part	The Director-General supports the intention of Objective IB-O2, however, considers the wording could be amended to better align with the NPSIB exposure draft.	Amend the wording of Objective IB-O2 as follows: Indigenous biodiversity is ~~managed to maintain its extent and diversity~~ protected, maintained, and restored in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.		Reject
FS225.13	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	Promotes the protection and restoration of indigenous biodiversity	Allow		Reject
FS225.19	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	Protection and restoration should be part of Objective IB-O2.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS339.045	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Protecting, maintaining and restoring indigenous biodiversity reflects sustainable management of eco-systems.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS548.088	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendments sought will create unrealistic requirements for landowners in terms of indigenous biodiversity and significant natural areas	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS354.110	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks that indigenous biodiversity is protected, maintained, and restored The NPSIB does not seek protected, maintained, and restored so the policy is not consistent with the NPSIB	Disallow	Disallow S364.032	Accept
FS570.1113	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
FS346.172	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
FS566.1127	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
FS569.1149	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
S463.027	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-O2	Oppose	WBF supports the apparent intent of this objective. However, the statement regarding management to maintain extent and diversity is unclear and may be interpreted as a "hard" environmental bottom line that could inappropriately constrain ecological restoration or regeneration projects. WBF suggests a reference to "no net loss" of diversity and extent may be a more appropriate way to clarify the objective and ensure that maintenance of extent is not	Amend Objective IB-O2 as follows: Indigenous biodiversity is managed to ensure no net loss of ~~maintain~~ its extent and diversity, and in a way that provides for the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				treated as a requirement to avoid all adverse effects.			
FS28.001	Dr John L Craig		Support	The submitter agrees with the apparent intent of this objective. However, the statement regarding management to maintain extent and diversity is unclear and may be interpreted as a "hard" environmental bottom line that could inappropriately constrain ecological restoration or regeneration projects. Suggest a reference to "no net loss" and can include "past actions to land "of diversity and extent may be a more appropriate way to clarify the objective and ensure that maintenance of extent is not treated as a requirement to avoid all adverse effects. Offsetting should be available in all environments. Furthermore, positive past actions by landowners should be considered as Offsets for future action. This would encourage landowners to undertake multiple positive actions toward indigenous species and ecosystems without unnecessarily constraining future use.	Allow in part	Amend IB-O2 as follows 'Indigenous biodiversity is managed to ensure no net loss of maintain its extent and diversity, and in a way that provides for the social, economic, and cultural well-being of people and communities.'	Reject
S354.019	The BOI Watchdogs	IB-O2	Oppose	Controls should not be placed on the ownership of dogs until BOI Watchdog concerns have been addressed in order to determine if they are appropriate. Refer to full submission.	Delete this objective.		Reject
FS570.1028	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
FS566.1042	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
FS569.1064	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
S160.015	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	IB-O2	Support	The submitter supports objective IB-O2 and considers that it is important that indigenous biodiversity is managed to	Retain objective IB-O2 as it is written.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consider social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities.			
FS346.585	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
S568.001	Scrumptious Fruit Trust	IB-O2	Support in part	the well being of communities is a consequence of that primary objective	amend IB-O2 should read that indigenous biodiversity is managed to maintain its extent and diversity in a way that provides for itself primarily to be preserved and flourish.		Reject
FS348.228	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
S421.135	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	IB-O3	Support	Federated Farmers has a significant interest in this chapter of the proposed district plan. The preservation of indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity has and will continue to create tensions between private landowners, Iwi and Councils. The approach taken to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity is that landowners should it as a valuable asset rather than a hindrance. As part of this, it is important that activities such as lambing, calving, shelter, water supply and takes, fencing, access and works for access and fire breaks are permitted throughout the plan. Federated Farmers supports the Council removing the previous mapping that was included in the draft plan and the movement toward assessments being made where the permitted activity threshold has not been complied with.	Retain Objective IB-O3 or wording with similar effect		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1367	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
FS346.369	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
FS566.1381	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
FS569.1403	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
S394.027	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	IB-O3	Support	This provision neatly captures the interrelationship between ss 6(c) and 6(e) RMA.	Retain Objective IB-O3		Accept
FS588.027	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our wahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS363.027	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
FS538.027	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
FS537.027	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
FS536.027	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
FS535.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS533.027	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
FS532.027	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
FS531.027	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
FS530.027	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
FS529.027	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
FS528.027	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
FS527.027	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
FS526.027	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
FS525.027	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
FS524.027	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
FS523.027	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
FS522.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS521.027	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
FS520.027	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
FS519.027	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
FS518.027	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
FS517.027	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
FS516.027	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
FS515.027	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
FS514.027	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
FS513.027	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
FS512.027	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
FS511.027	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
FS510.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS509.027	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
FS508.027	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
FS507.027	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
FS506.027	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
FS505.027	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
FS504.027	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
FS503.027	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
FS502.027	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
FS501.027	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
FS500.027	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
FS499.027	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
FS498.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS497.027	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
FS496.027	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
FS495.027	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
FS494.027	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
FS493.027	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
FS492.027	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
FS491.027	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
FS490.027	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
FS489.027	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
FS487.027	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
FS486.027	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
FS485.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS483.027	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
FS482.027	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
FS481.027	Peggy Joanne Matu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS480.027	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
FS479.027	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
FS478.027	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
FS477.027	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
FS476.027	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
FS475.027	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
FS474.027	Steven Matu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS473.027	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
FS472.027	Krystal-Jade Matu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS471.027	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
FS470.027	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
FS469.027	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
FS468.027	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
FS467.027	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
FS466.027	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
FS465.027	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
FS464.027	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
FS463.027	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
FS462.027	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
FS461.027	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
FS460.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS459.027	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
FS458.027	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
FS457.027	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
FS456.027	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
FS455.027	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
FS454.027	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
FS453.027	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
FS452.027	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
FS451.027	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
FS450.027	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
FS447.027	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
FS440.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS439.027	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
FS436.027	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
FS435.027	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
FS434.027	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
FS433.027	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
FS432.027	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
FS431.027	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
FS430.027	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
FS429.027	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
FS428.027	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
FS427.027	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
FS426.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS425.027	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
FS423.027	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
FS422.027	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
FS421.027	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
FS420.027	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
FS418.027	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
FS417.027	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
FS416.027	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
FS415.027	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
FS408.027	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
FS388.027	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
FS387.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS386.027	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
FS385.027	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
FS382.027	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
FS381.027	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
FS380.027	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
FS379.027	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
FS378.027	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
FS365.027	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
FS360.027	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
FS359.027	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
FS358.027	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
FS357.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS356.027	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
FS568.027	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
FS567.027	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
FS563.027	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
FS562.027	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
FS561.027	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	Accept
FS560.027	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	Accept
FS559.027	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
FS558.027	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
FS557.027	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
FS556.027	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
FS555.027	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS553.027	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
FS552.027	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
FS551.027	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
FS546.027	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
FS545.027	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
FS544.027	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
FS178.027	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
FS413.027	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
S259.003	Nicole Wooster	IB-O4	Support in part	Landowners also take on a steward role especially with intergenerational properties and the policy framework should recognise this. Our farm has been in family ownership for 4 generations and the intention is for it to stay in family ownership. The land is not just a financial asset it is our home and a place for the wider family to stay connected to. Due to this stewardship of the land has not been as extensively farmed, unlike neighbouring land, and has areas of regenerating vegetation.	Insert recognition that landowners are also stewards of the land, not just tangata whenua.		Accept
S421.136	Northland Federated	IB-O4	Support	Federated Farmers has a significant interest in this chapter of the proposed district plan. The preservation of indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity has and will	Retain Objective IB-O4 or wording with similar effect		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand			continue to create tensions between private landowners, Iwi and Councils. The approach taken to indigenous ecosystems and biodiversity is that landowners should it as a valuable asset rather than a hindrance. As part of this, it is important that activities such as lambing, calving, shelter, water supply and takes, fencing, access and works for access and fire breaks are permitted throughout the plan. Federated Farmers supports the Council removing the previous mapping that was included in the draft plan and the movement toward assessments being made where the permitted activity threshold has not been complied with.			
FS570.1368	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
FS346.370	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
FS566.1382	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
FS569.1404	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
S463.028	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-O5	Support	WBF supports this objective (inferred).	Retain Objective IB-O5		Accept
S364.033	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-O5	Support	The Director-General supports Objective IB-O5	Retain Objective IB-O5		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1114	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
FS346.173	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1128	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
FS569.1150	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
S396.023	Matauri X Incorporation	Policies	Oppose	Matauri X do not believe that the provisions of the aforementioned Chapter appropriately meet section 6(e) of the RMA 1991. The approach also does not promote kaitiakitanga and the entire chapter is rejected.	delete policies		Reject
S425.024	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Policies	Oppose	Council have not mapped 'significant natural areas' (SNA) but have included reference to SNA in rules. PHTTCCT consider the absence of mapping SNA will result in implementation confusion and unnecessary cost to PHTTCCT in order to determine compliance.	amend IB to: - Remove reference to significant natural areas in rules and rely on indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds.		Accept in part
S425.027	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Policies	Not Stated	Furthermore, the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	amend provisions to ensure that maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.		Accept
S339.026	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	Subject to the relief sought in submission point 14 of submission lodged, TACDL consider new policies are needed to provide for these changes. However, it is considered that the requirement for these areas to be incorporated into a district plan	Insert a new policy as follows: Encourage the protection of areas of significant indigenous biodiversity and habitats at the time of subdivision and development.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				schedule as being inappropriate as this would require a Schedule 1 Plan change process to be undertaken.			
S339.027	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	Policies	Not Stated	TACDL is supportive of FNDC's intention to provide assistance to landowners to protect and manage important indigenous vegetation and habitats, particularly to Māori as they are heavily burdened with the management of these resources for the benefit of the public good.	Insert new policy as follows: Provide assistance to landowners to that have large areas of indigenous vegetation that meet the criteria of being significant		Reject
S421.137	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Policies	Support in part	There are concerns that the policies do not provide for existing activities to continue. There needs to be an additional policy that recognises and provides for existing activities such as grazing and other farming activities to continue as long as the scale and intensity of effects do not / have not increased following the commencement date of the plan.	Insert a new policy as follows: IB-P11 Provide recognition for grazing and farming existing activities that have not increased in their scale or intensity of effects from commencement date of the plan. or wording with similar intent		Reject
FS24.16	Lynley Newport		Support	A good inclusion.	Allow		Reject
FS570.1369	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
FS346.371	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
FS566.1383	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
FS569.1405	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
S276.004	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the rules do not prevent incremental loss.	Delete policies IB-P1, IB-P2 and IB-P3 and replace these with Policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.39	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.41	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.40	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.59	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.079	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, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land. There is a need to balance reasonable use and protection, particularly where enabling some development would better assist with protecting the balance of the land. The notified rules of the proposed plan better provide for these matters than those sought by the submitter.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.174	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
FS570.801	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
FS566.815	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
FS569.837	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
S276.005	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the rules do not prevent incremental loss.	Insert a policy that recognises that not all significant natural areas will be mapped and that unmapped areas are to have, as far as practicable, the same level of protection in the proposed Plan as mapped Significant Natural Areas. Insert Operative Plan policies 12.2.4.1, 12.2.4.3, 12.2.4.5, 12.2.4.10, 12.2.4.11, 12.2.4.12, 12.2.4.13 and 12.2.4.14 to the policy section of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter.		Accept in part
FS67.40	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.41	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.60	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.080	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, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land. There is a need to balance reasonable use and protection, particularly where enabling some development would better assist with protecting the balance of the land. The notified rules of the proposed plan better provide for these matters than those sought by the submitter.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.175	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
FS570.802	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
FS566.816	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
FS569.838	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
S364.035	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Policies	Support in part	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General holds concerns that the wording of the policy in its current format will result in no SNAs being scheduled in the Proposed District Plan, as landowners will have the ability to refuse.	Insert a separate policy for mapping additional SNAs as they are identified		Accept in part
FS67.41	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.42	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.42	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.61	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.1	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity is now operative. It requires the Council to have completed an assessment and include within the District Plan the location, a map and a description of attributes for all Significant Natural Areas by 2027-28. While consultants have identified and mapped SNAs, community consultation has yet to occur. Given the national requirement and scale of areas identified so far, it would be appropriate for the Central Government to assist with this process.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS339.047	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	Areas contained in the Wildlands report should be included as SNA's, however this report is not exhaustive. Identification of SNA's needs to be an iterative process if s 6(c) RMA is to be properly implemented. SNA should be treated as such whether identified or not. SNA identification is not dependent on landholder agreement. Since this submission was made, the NZPSIB has commenced. Resourcing hapū or iwi to identify SNA's will assist in identification of such areas.	Allow in part	Amend IB-P1 as follows: " a. using the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 1 National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity; b. including areas that meet the ecological significance criteria as Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4; c. delete; d. providing assistance to landowners and hapū or iwi to add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan"	Accept in part
FS548.091	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1116	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
FS346.175	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
FS566.1130	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
FS569.1152	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
S364.036	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Policies	Not Stated	The Director-General requests a new policy to ensure the characteristics that contribute to the significance of SNAs (i.e. fauna) are protected.	Insert new policy, with wording, or similar wording, as follows: Recognise and protect SNAs by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.42	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.43	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.43	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.62	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS339.049	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	While we support the general intention of the proposed amendment, we consider recognition and provision for protection of significant areas is required. Levels of acceptable adverse effects should be certain.	Allow in part	Amend new policy as sought in the original submission as follows: 'Recognise and provide for the protection of scheduled and unscheduled SNAs by avoiding adverse effects on the characteristics that contribute to their significance.	Accept in part
FS570.1117	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
FS346.176	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
FS566.1131	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
FS569.1153	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
S431.094	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna be protected for the purpose of promoting sustainable management with attention		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					being given to: (a) maintaining ecological values; (b) maintaining quality and resilience; (c) maintaining the variety and range of indigenous species contributing to biodiversity; (d) maintaining ecological integrity; and (e) maintaining tikanga Maori in the context of the above. Note: In determining whether a subdivision, use or development is appropriate in areas containing significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, Council shall consider each application on a case by case basis, giving due weight to Part II of the Act as well as those matters listed above		
FS67.43	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.44	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.44	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.63	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.130	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.094	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS404.040	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons.	Accept in part
FS173.1	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	The Policy the submitter has identified for inclusion provides for the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and should be reinstated.	Allow		Accept in part
S431.095	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are avoided, remedied or mitigated by: (a) seeking alternatives to		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the disturbance of habitats where practicable; (b) managing the scale, intensity, type and location of subdivision, use and development in a way that avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse ecological effects; (c) ensuring that where any disturbance occurs it is undertaken in a way that, as far as practicable: (i) minimises any edge effects; (ii) avoids the removal of specimen trees; (iii) does not result in linkages with other areas being lost; (iv) avoids adverse effects on threatened species; (v) minimises disturbance of root systems of remaining vegetation;(vi) does not result in the introduction of exotic weed species or pest animals;(d) encouraging, and where appropriate, requiring active pest control and avoiding the grazing of such areas		
FS67.44	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.45	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.45	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.82	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Support most of this. Don't support requiring people to do pest management on their properties. It doesn't state in the summary, but if there is a suggestion of banning companion animals, I do not support that.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS66.64	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.131	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.095	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
FS404.041	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS173.2	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	The Policy the submitter has identified provides for the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna from adverse effects and needs to be reinstated.	Allow		Accept in part
S431.096	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That the contribution of areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna to the overall biodiversity and amenity of the District be taken into account in evaluating applications for resource consents.		Accept in part
FS67.45	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.46	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.46	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.65	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.132	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.096	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
FS404.042	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
FS173.3	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	The Policy the submitter has identified for inclusion recognises the importance of indigenous fauna and needs to be reinstated.	Allow		Accept in part
S529.116	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Oppose	The PDP provisions do not provide the level of protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision	Amend the PDP policies to reflect the level of protection in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision		Accept in part
FS67.46	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.47	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.47	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.66	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.2004	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2018	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2040	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.132	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	A large number of indigenous species are currently classed as threatened or at risk under the national NZ Threat Classification System.⁴ About 50 indigenous bird species have become extinct in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result of human activities.⁵ Many technical and policy reports have noted that concerted action is required to prevent further deterioration.⁶ As noted above, RMA s31(1) applies to decision-making in relation to the use and development of land - District Council functions include 'the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of ... (iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity'. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland and Regional Plan contain a number of provisions that refer to aspects of biodiversity that are not about mapped SNAs (Box 1, below, provides examples). As noted above, under s75 of the RMA, the DP is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, and must avoid inconsistency with the Regional Plan. The DP can be more stringent than the RPS, but cannot be more relaxed	Amend the policies to address RPS s4.4 regarding 'Maintaining and enhancing indigenous ecosystems and species' and 'indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk'.		Accept in part
FS67.47	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.48	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.49	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS69.48	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.67	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS570.2020	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2034	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2056	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S542.004	Marianna Fenn	Policies	Support	Need to include a policy of identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are likely to be particularly vulnerable and/or change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and establish buffer zones where appropriate. An example is ensuring there are buffer zones around coastal wetlands that anticipate and provide for inland retreat	Add new policy Identify areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are particularly vulnerable and/or likely to change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and, where appropriate, establish buffer zones to ensure that these areas are able to move and persist		Accept in part
FS88.43	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.2132	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
FS346.867	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2146	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.2168	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
S431.097	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: In order to protect areas of significant indigenous fauna: (a) that dogs (excluding working dogs), cats, possums, rats, mustelids and other pest species are not introduced into areas with populations of kiwi, dotterel and brown teal; (b) in areas where dogs, cats, possums, rats, mustelids and other pest species are having adverse effects on indigenous fauna their removal is promoted		Accept in part
FS88.83	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	1. Oppose strongly. Where these animals are pets and not wild, they should be allowed (under careful management) in these areas.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.133	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.097	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
FS404.043	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
FS173.4	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	The Policy the submitter has identified for inclusion recognises the actual and potential impacts of introduced mammals on indigenous species, including predation and disturbance arising from domestic pets. The Policy also provides for the protection of indigenous biodiversity from introduced mammals and needs to be reinstated.	Allow		Accept in part
S431.098	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That when considering resource consent applications in areas identified as known high density kiwi habitat, the Council may impose conditions, in order to protect kiwi and their habitat.		Accept in part
FS88.84	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Support reasonable and research based requirements for kiwi and other wildlife protection.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Do not support unreasonable requirements. Definitely do not support bans on companion animals. If the area is important to kiwi or other creatures, then don't allow subdivision. Minor dwellings, sheds, etc, that will have little effect should not require masses of red tape so the owner had to do councils/DOCs job for them.			
FS23.134	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.098	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
FS404.044	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
FS173.5	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	Kiwi are taonga species but their populations are continuing to decline in areas without predator control and dog control. Existing populations and habitats need to be maintained - this Policy recognises the value of kiwi and their habitat and needs to be reinstated.	Allow		Accept in part
S128.003	Lynley Newport	Policies	Support in part	Comment: Part e of what is currently IB-1 clearly places the onus (and cost) on the person seeking to carry out indigenous vegetation clearance to identify any SNA. This is a complete reversal from the methodology promoted in the Draft District Plan which was that the Council bore the initial cost, and had in fact already paid for that work, using ratepayer funds, in mapping SNAs throughout the district. This mapping got dropped through public pressure and landowners were led to believe that SNAs were being dropped altogether. Now they will find that SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule. The Council intends to build up its Schedule and Maps through the methods listed in Policy IB-PI. There is no doubt or argument that habitat of ecological significance needs to be identified and protected, it is the methodology that is in question. Is the cost going to fall entirely on a landowner? Or is there scope for shared costs between landowner and community/Council? Is all the work to map SNAs done to date (funded by	Amend policy/ies to include the 'proposed SNA map layer' as a non-statutory map layer, available to landowners and professionals to use as a guide to identifying SNA's when preparing applications.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ratepayers) going to be discarded? Or can that information be retained and be a readily accessible resource available to assist landowner and Council?			
FS196.81	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
S483.146	Top Energy Limited	Policies	Not Stated	Top Energy acknowledges that objectives and policies for infrastructure within SNAs are located within the Infrastructure Chapter but seek to ensure that appropriate provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of electricity infrastructure (in particular) is made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter in alignment with method 4.6.3, Policies 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 given that it also relates to indigenous vegetation clearance not captured as significant	Insert additional policies that recognise the need for the location of new infrastructure within areas containing indigenous biodiversity where there is an operational and functional need, and any adverse effects are adequately managed. Insert additional policy that provides for the operation, maintenance repair and upgrading of infrastructure within areas of indigenous biodiversity.		Accept in part
FS196.213	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS111.076	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure should be made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.073	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.197	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
S442.174	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support	Need to include a policy of identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are likely to be particularly vulnerable and/or change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and establish buffer zones where appropriate. An example is ensuring there are buffer zones around coastal wetlands that anticipate and provide for inland retreat.	Insert new policy Identify areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are particularly vulnerable and/or likely to change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and, where appropriate, establish buffer zones to		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					ensure that these areas are able to move and persist.		
FS66.68	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.785	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
S431.093	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Insert a further policy that recognises that not all significant natural areas will be mapped and that such unmapped areas are to have, as far as practicable, the same level of protection in the proposed Plan as mapped Significant Natural Areas		Accept in part
FS23.129	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.093	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
FS404.039	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
S431.099	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That habitat restoration be promoted.		Accept in part
FS23.135	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.099	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
FS404.045	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
FS173.6	Russell Landcare Trust		Support	For 22 years, Russell Landcare has been working to protect and restore indigenous habitat on Russell Peninsula and, therefore, supports this submission.	Allow		Accept in part
S431.100	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	Insert the following policy: That the maintenance of riparian vegetation and habitats be recognised and provided for, and their restoration encouraged, for the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, preservation of natural character and the maintenance of general ecosystem health and indigenous biodiversity		Accept in part
FS23.136	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.			
FS332.0100	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
FS404.046	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part
FS173.7	Russell Landcare Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S431.101	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for	Insert the following policy: That when considering an application to clear areas		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act.	of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, enabling Maori to provide for the sustainable management of their ancestral land will be recognised and provided for by Council		
FS23.137	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.101	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
FS404.047	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.			
S364.009	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Policies	Not Stated	With the advent of myrtle rust, all Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa are currently considered threatened. The taxonomy and current threatened status of manuka and kanuka should be reflected and managed appropriately through objectives, policies and rules in the proposed plan. The relief sought is to be confirmed during the subsequent District Plan review stages once the 2022 version of the "Conservation status of New Zealand indigenous vascular plants" is available.	Amend objectives, policies and rules as appropriate to recognise and implement measures to address and manage the increased threat status of myrtle rust for manuka and kanuka		Reject
FS548.084	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring. As well, manuka and kanuka cause significant tissues for farmers in that they can grow like a pest species and be very invasive in places.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1090	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
FS346.149	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1104	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
FS569.1126	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
S529.120	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part		Amend the PDP policies, to implement the objectives to 'protect, maintain and increase indigenous biodiversity for future generations', or protect significant vegetation and fauna 'for future generations		Accept in part
FS570.2008	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2022	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2044	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.138	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Not Stated	We consider that the DP should include Policy similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to this type of predation.	Insert new policy to protect kiwi, dotterel, brown teal and also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to this type of predation.		Accept
FS570.2026	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.2040	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.2062	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S77.004	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S40.005	Martin John Yurelich	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: • Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S41.005	Joel Vieviorka	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows:: • Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S163.008	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the Plan: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S377.005	Rua Hatu Trust	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S410.005	Kerry-Anne Smith	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S411.005	Roger Myles Smith	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S470.005	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S161.004	Shanon Garton	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S192.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	IB-P1	Support in part	Make IB-6 the very first policy. This policy is 'positive' not negative. It is 'encouraging' not discouraging. It is 'enabling' not punitive. It is the best possible way to start the suite of policies. It sets out what the	Amend IB-P1 by relegating it to follow what is currently IB-P6. Amend by adding an (f) written along similar lines to (e)but referring to the Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule: "requiring an assessment of	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Council can do for and with the landowner, not what the landowner must do. Make it even more positive and definitive by providing certainty - Council won't just 'consider' non regulatory methods, they will provide for. Relegate IB-1 to follow IB-6. This policy should refer to SUB-R6 (Environmental Benefit Subdivision) as another time/method to assess the significance of indigenous vegetation, potentially also SUB-R7 (Management Plan). Comment: Part of what is currently IB-1 clearly places the onus (and cost) on the person seeking to carry out indigenous vegetation clearance to identify any SNA. This is a complete reversal from the methodology promoted in the Draft District Plan which was that the Council bore the initial cost, and had in fact already paid for that work, using ratepayer funds, in mapping SNAs throughout the district. This mapping got dropped through public pressure and landowners were led to believe that SNAs were being dropped altogether. Now they will find that SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule. The Council intends to build up its Schedule and Maps through the methods listed in Policy IB-PI. There is no doubt or argument that habitat of ecological significance need to be identified and protected, it is the methodology that is in question. Is the cost going to fall entirely on a land owner? Or is there scope for shared costs between landowner and community/Council? Is all the work to map SNAs done to date (funded by ratepayers) going to be discarded? Or can that information be retained and be a readily accessible resource available to assist landowner and Council? The Council must cease and desist in its	the ecological significance of indigenous vegetation when subdividing pursuant to Rules SUB-R6 or SUB-R7";	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				use of negative, restrictive and punitive language around protecting valuable ecological resources and instead emphasise the positive, and incentivise, to achieve the same outcome.		
S333.015	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-P1	Oppose	Policy IB-P1 seeks to "encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development;..." This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners	Delete Policy IB-P1	Accept
S355.019	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-P1	Support in part	The PDP relies primarily on the identification of SNA's by using the methods and criteria outlined in Appendix 5 of the RPS. However, the criteria are principally based on ecological values and there is no provision or recognition of te ao Māori values or mātauranga Māori. In our view, IB-P1 needs to be broadened to ensure the following is achieved: - Engagement with tangata whenua is undertaken as part of the identification of any SNA's;- Mātauranga and tikanga Māori is incorporated. Additionally, it is considered that clarity and coherence of this policy would be improved by narrowing its focus to identification related directions only and establishing new policies to encourage protection and provide assistance.	Amend That requires engagement with tangata whenua to identify areas of significant ecosystems and biodiversity, particularly for the identification of taonga species Delete clauses (c) - (e) of policy IB-P1.	Accept in part
S368.089	Far North District Council	IB-P1	Support in part	Minor drafting change to improve readability in e.	Amend IB-P1 a. using the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or in any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity; b. including areas that meet the ecological significance criteria as Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan and on the planning maps where this is agreed with the landowner and verified by physical inspection where practicable; c. encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Plan at the time of subdivision and development; d. providing assistance to landowners to add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan; and e. requiring an assessment of the ecological significance for indigenous vegetation clearance to establish compliance with the permitted activity thresholds in Rules IB-R2 to IB-R4	
S187.015	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners.	Delete Policy IB-P1.	Accept
S356.061	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	IB-P1	Support	not stated	Retain IB-P1 as notified	Reject
S395.005	Sean Jozef Vercammen	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S222.022	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	Policy IB-P1 seeks to "encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and	Delete Policy IB-P1	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development;..." This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners.		
S472.042	Michael Foy	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S473.003	Adams-Te Whata Whanau Trust	IB-P1	Support in part	IB-P1 as a pensioner, I am concerned about the cost of obtaining an assessment of the ecological significance for indigenous vegetation clearance to establish permitted activity thresholds in rule R2-R4. I received no income from my land.	amend IB-P1 for Council to provide assessments of ecological significance for indigenous vegetation clearance, or fund or contribute to the costs of beneficiaries needing to obtain an assessment of the ecological significance of their land	Accept in part
S479.013	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-P1	Oppose	The PDP relies primarily on the identification of SNA's by using the methods and criteria outlined in Appendix 5 of the RPS. However, the criteria are principally based on ecological values and there is no provision or recognition of te ao Māori values or mātauranga Māori. In our view, IB-P1 needs to be broadened to ensure the following is achieved: Engagement with tangata whenua is undertaken as part of the identification of any SNA's; Mātauranga and tikanga Māori is incorporated.	Amend the policy to require engagement with tangata whenua to identify areas of significant ecosystems and biodiversity, particularly for the identification of taonga species.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S479.014	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-P1	Oppose	It is considered that clarity and coherence of this policy would be improved by narrowing its focus to identification related directions only and establishing new policies to encourage protection and provide assistance.	Delete clauses (c) - (e) of policy IB-P1.	Accept in part
S547.005	LJ King Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S544.005	Kelvin Richard Horsford	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S348.011	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S439.005	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend Policy IB-P1: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to work in partnership with landowners given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S519.044	Elbury Holdings	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
S261.005	Amber Hookway	IB-P1	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the Proposed District Plan and reinstate Policy 13.4.6 from the Operative District Plan: That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.		Accept in part
FS297.9	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.31	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.9	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.9	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.26	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S264.005	Wilson Hookway	IB-P1	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include Identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the Proposed District Plan and reinstate Policy 13.4.6 from the Operative District Plan: That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.		Accept in part
FS297.10	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS100.32	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.10	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.10	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.27	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S243.024	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	Policy IB-P1 seeks to "encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development;..." This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners.	Delete Policy IB-P1		Accept
FS24.36	Lynley Newport		Support	The submitter has identified a valid 'procedural' / 'legislative' issue - process for populating a Schedule needs to be clarified.	Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.582	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
FS566.596	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
FS569.618	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
S357.034	Sean Frieling	IB-P1	Oppose	Despite clear opposition to SNA mapping, provisions in the PDP have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowners to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA. None of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. Overall rural landowners have of their own volition increased not decreased the areas of SNA. Council is now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to restore wetlands, waterways and bush areas. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA in the District, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. Modify the approach to mapping and identification of SNA in accordance with the draft NPS for indigenous biodiversity. Insert incentives, not disincentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land. Amend the options for bush protection. Make SNA mapping available to the public.		Accept in part
FS24.37	Lynley Newport		Support	Submitter quite correctly points out all the negative and restrictive approaches being taken by FNDC - need to look to a positive, innovative and incentives approach	Allow		Accept in part
S364.034	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P1	Support in part	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General holds concerns that the wording of the policy in its current format will result in	Amend Policy IB-P1 as follows: Identify Significant Natural Areas by: a. using the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 5 of the RPS or in any more recent National Policy Statement on indigenous biodiversity; ~~b. including areas that meet the ecological significance criteria as Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan and on~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				no SNAs being scheduled in the Proposed District Plan, as landowners will have the ability to refuse. It is requested that the wording of Policy IB-P1 be amended to ensure areas that meet SNA criteria are suitably protected. The Director-General encourages ground truthing/physical inspection to ensure the areas scheduled as SNAs meet the relevant criteria.	~~the planning maps where this is agreed with the landowner and verified by physical inspection where practicable; c. encouraging landowners to include including identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; d. providing assistance to landowners to add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan; and e. requiring an assessment of the ecological significance for indigenous vegetation clearance to establish permitted activity thresholds in Rule 1BR2-R4.~~		
FS24.38	Lynley Newport		Oppose	too much emphasis on what a landowner MUST do, at their expense. whilst there is a valid cautionary note in regard to legislative process for populating a schedule, I do not agree with DoC's mandatory stance.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.49	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.51	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.50	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.70	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS349.003	Northland Regional Council		Support	It is appropriate that the district plan policies reflect the direction of the NPS-IB	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS339.046	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	Areas contained in the Wildlands report should be included as SNA's, however this report is not exhaustive. Identification of SNA's needs to be an iterative process if s 6(c) RMA is to be properly implemented. SNA should be treated as such whether	Allow in part	Amend IB-P1 as follows: " a. using the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 1 National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity; b. including areas that meet the ecological significance criteria as Significant	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				identified or not. SNA identification is not dependent on landholder agreement. Since this submission was made, the NZPSIB has commenced. Resourcing hapū or iwi to identify SNA's will assist in identification of such areas.		Natural Areas in Schedule 4; c. delete; d. providing assistance to landowners and hapū or iwi to add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan"	
FS548.089	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1115	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
FS346.174	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
FS566.1129	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
FS569.1151	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
S148.016	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-P1	Not Stated	SFNZ acknowledges the statements made regarding the high proportion of the District that has potentially significant ecological values and the fact that over half of those lands are in private ownership. As noted, this creates potential tension between those seeking to protect those areas and those wishing to make reasonable economic use of their lands. It is essential that the Plan takes a pragmatic approach to protecting significant natural areas and allowing people to meet their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing by: - Ensuring there is certainty about what is or is not an SNA including drawing clear	Amend IB-P1 to clearly state that Council will "work with all landowners to accurately map and schedule all SNA within the district" or words of like effect		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				boundaries between rural production areas and SNA and ensuring there is reliable mapping of SNA across the district. - Supporting landowners with the costs of identifying and managing SNA on their lands - Avoiding unnecessary compliance costs associated with potential SNA and rural production activities. IB-P1 should explicitly state that Council will work with landowners to accurately map all SNA across the district.			
FS67.48	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.50	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.49	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.69	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS354.111	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	It is the council's responsibility under the NPSIB to map SNA's.	Allow	Allow S148.016	Accept in part
FS346.522	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
FS566.128	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
S511.057	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P1	Oppose	SNAs need to be identified and mapped throughout the district not just where landowners agree	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.50	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.52	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.51	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.71	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS349.007	Northland Regional Council		Support	The Proposed Plan provisions should be consistent with the requirements of the NPS-IB	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS164.057	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
FS548.154	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes the relief sought as it is unclear exactly what the submitter wants. Federated Farmers supports the recognition of the importance of the role that landowners play in maintaining indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1628	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
FS566.1642	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1664	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
S431.090	John Andrew Riddell	IB-P1	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act. Further directive guidance on the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is given by policy 11 of the Coastal Policy Statement and policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement. The proposed Plan does not give effect to these policies.	Delete Policies IB-P1, IB-P2 and IB-P3 and replace with a reproduced Policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Accept in part
FS67.51	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.53	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.52	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.72	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.126	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.090	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS404.038	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons	Accept in part
S442.076	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P1	Oppose	SNAs need to be identified and mapped throughout the district not just where landowners agree.	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs.		Accept in part
FS67.52	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.54	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.53	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.73	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS570.1772	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.687	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
S442.175	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P1	Oppose	If SNAs are to be protected for future generations they must be identified and mapped throughout the district. This will serve to educate landowners about the value of biodiversity on their land, enable targeted support, and address the risk of incremental district wide loss and degradation of SNA areas.	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs. If SNAs based solely on the presence of regenerating manuka / kanuka are included, these areas should be separately identified and clearly distinguished from other SNAs. These manuka / kanuka SNAs could also be subject to a separate, slightly more permissive, rule regime. A large percentage of our property at 903B Kohumaru Rd is identified as SNA and, subject to the boundaries of those SNA areas being refined, I support that designation.		Accept in part
FS67.53	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.55	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.54	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.74	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.786	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
S541.005	Elbury Holdings	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
FS155.48	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S485.044	Elbury Holdings	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
FS155.49	Fiona King		Support		Allow	Accept in part
S542.005	Marianna Fenn	IB-P1	Oppose	If SNAs are to be protected for future generations they must be identified and mapped throughout the district. This will serve to educate landowners about the value of biodiversity on their land, enable targeted support, and address the risk of incremental district wide loss and degradation of SNA areas	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs. If SNAs based solely on the presence of regenerating manuka / kanuka are included, these areas should be separately identified and clearly distinguished from other SNAs. These manuka / kanuka SNAs could also be subject to a separate, slightly more permissive, rule regime. A large percentage of our property at 903B Kohumaru Rd is identified as SNA and, subject to the boundaries of those SNA areas being refined, I support that designation	Accept in part
FS88.44	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS323.4	Nicole Wooster		Support in part	A different regime should be applied to SNA that consist of large areas of manuka / kanuka	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.2133	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
FS346.868	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2147	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
FS569.2169	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
S49.003	Paul O'Connor	IB-P1	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps from the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging and ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.	Amend to assist land owners with the SNA identification process - thus encouraging them to protect SNA areas.		Accept in part
FS323.2	Nicole Wooster		Support	As per the submission	Allow		Accept in part
S559.019	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P1	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules	Delete IB-P1 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.			
FS151.327	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.265	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.2209	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
FS348.046	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
FS566.2223	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
FS569.2245	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
S128.001	Lynley Newport	IB-P1	Support in part	Relegate Policy IB-P1 to follow IB-6. This policy should refer to SUB-R6 (environmental benefit) as another time/method to assess the significance of indigenous vegetation, potentially also SUB-R7 (Management Plan).	Amend Policy IB-P1 by relegating it to follow what is currently Policy IB-P6. Amend by adding an (f) written along similar lines to (e) but referring to the Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule: <i>"requiring an assessment of the ecological significance of indigenous vegetation when subdividing pursuant to Rules SUB-R6 or SUB-R7"</i>		Reject
FS28.014	Dr John L Craig		Support	This policy should refer to SUB-R6 as another time/method to assess the significance of indigenous vegetation.	Allow	Amend IB-P1 to align with IB-P6 to include reference to working with groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects and SUB-R6 (inferred)..	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS548.029	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The amendment sought by the submitter is onerous and costly.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
S339.025	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-P1	Not Stated	The PDP relies primarily on the identification of SNA's by using the methods and criteria outlined in Appendix 5 of the RPS. However, the criteria are principally based on ecological values and there is no provision or recognition of te ao Māori values or mātauranga Māori. In TACDL's view, IB-P1 needs to be broadened to ensure the following is achieved: - Engagement with tangata whenua is undertaken as part of the identification of any SNA's; - Mātauranga and tikanga Māori is incorporated. Further, in TACDL's view, this policy lacks clarity and purpose as an identification policy as it includes other directives that do not relate to identification. Finally, TACDL oppose the inclusion of clause (e) as they consider this to be overly onerous and inappropriate. For these reasons, TACDL seek amendments to improve clarity and legibility. On this basis, TACDL considers separate policies need to be created to provide direction for the desired outcomes.	Amend Policy IB-P1 to delete points c, d and e, and insert a new point as follows: Identify Significant Natural Areas by: a... b... ; and c. engaging with the mana whenua of the area to identify taonga species in accordance with mātauranga Māori. ~~c. encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development;~~ ~~d. providing assistance to landownersto add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan;~~ ~~and e. requiring an assessment of the ecological significance for indigenous vegetation clearance to establish permitted activity thresholds in Rule IB R2-R4.~~		Accept in part
FS339.023	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	Mātauranga is relevant to identifying significant flora and the significant habitat of fauna.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S167.015	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners.	Delete Policy IB-P1		Accept
FS548.058	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supported the policy and the inclusion of the proposed schedule in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.377	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
S168.022	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	This policy cannot be achieved unless by way of 4th schedule process private plan change which is an unreasonable burden to place on landowners.	Delete Policy IB-P1		Accept
FS548.062	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supported the policy and the inclusion of the proposed schedule in the Proposed District Plan.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject
S146.005	Trevor John Ashford	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS393.006	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.005	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of our land is in part within a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S399.057	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	IB-P1	Not Stated	Council is required to map significant natural areas. "Encouraging" landowners at the time of subdivision and development is inadequate to achieve this requirement. When resource consent is required is one of the few opportunities Council has to exert control over this process.	Amend point c. of Policy IB-P1 as follows: c. ~~encouraging~~ requiring landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development;		Accept in part
FS401.029	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Oppose	The inclusion of a SNA in Schedule 4 at the time of development / subdivision is opposed as this would require a Private Plan Change which is an additional cost to the Further Submitter. This would be cumbersome and costly for the Further Submitter. Any SNA would in any event be protected via conditions of consent therein negating changes to the District Plan at that time. The Council can, of its own volition, proceed with a Plan Change to include a number of SNA's in the District Plan as and when required.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S160.016	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	IB-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports policy IB-P1, in part and considers that the mapping of SNAs is critical to provide certainty to the landowner and that relying on a definition that is open to interpretation or requires experts to carry out surveys is not conducive to managing SNAs.	Amend policy IB-P1 to state all SNAs will be mapped.		Accept in part
FS346.586	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
S67.002	Michael John Winch	IB-P1	Support	My property at Totara North (Allot 25 Parish of Totara) comprises 35ha of mature native forest that meets the criteria for a	retain policy IB-P1		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Significant Natural Area in Appendix 5 of the RPS. The whole of the title is subject to a QEII Open Space covenant. I agree to the land being identified as a SNA in Schedule 4 of the District Plan.			
FS346.825	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.051	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
S569.005	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS348.236	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
S464.005	LJ King Ltd	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		
FS566.1550	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S543.005	LJ King Limited	IB-P1	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	• Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing • Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		Accept in part
FS566.2166	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.016	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-P2	Support in part	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna ;		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.	
S187.016	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna □ and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.	Accept in part
S187.017	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.	Accept in part
S222.023	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P2	Support in part	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					;and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.		
S168.023	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and ...		Accept in part
FS112.5	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. As SNAs are not mapped, this should be amended to remedy, mitigate, or offset adverse effect of land use and subdivision on areas of indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.0010	Dr John L Craig		Support	As SNAs are not mapped, this should be amended to remedy, mitigate, or offset adverse effect of land use and subdivision on areas significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Allow	Amend IB-P2 as follows: 'avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna...';	Accept in part
S431.091	John Andrew Riddell	IB-P2	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act. Further directive guidance on the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is given by policy 11 of the Coastal Policy Statement and policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement. The proposed Plan does not give effect to these policies.	Delete Policies IB-P1, IB-P2 and IB-P3 and replace with a reproduced Policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.54	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.56	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.55	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.75	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.127	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict a reasonable use being able to be made of land	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.091	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
S568.002	Scrumptious Fruit Trust	IB-P2	Support in part		amend IB-P2 to give an express requirement that any domestic, non indigenous animal, is generally not permitted, and if permitted, rules and by laws will promote strict direct controls - eg if dogs permitted in some foreshore areas must be on a leash		Accept in part
FS88.77	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	Agree pet animals should be managed to avoid risk to wildlife. Disagree on banning dogs or other pet animals. Where shorebirds are nesting, a dogs-on-leads rule should be made, but only during nesting season. There is no need to ban our family pets, only to keep them from causing damage.	Allow in part		Accept
FS348.229	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA			
S559.020	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P2	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-P2 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part
FS151.328	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.266	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2210	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.047	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2224	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
FS569.2246	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
S463.029	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	WBF opposes the uncertainty of subclause (b) insofar as it refers to the avoidance of effects on "...areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems". Unless the composition of "important and vulnerable" is clearly quantified/stated in the Proposed Plan, the interpretation and application of this policy is unduly vague. If this is a reference to species that are the New Zealand Threat Classification List, that should be clearly expressed, and provision made for future updates to that List.	Delete sub-clause b. of Objective IB-P2 or amend it to clarify the reference to "important and vulnerable" features.		Accept in part
FS91.8	Moana Kiff		Oppose	We whole heartedly support sub clause (b)of IB-P2, which emphasises the importance of avoiding significant adverse effects and addressing remedying or mitigating other adverse effects of land use and sub division on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and eco systems within the coastal environment. This sub clause under scores the critical need to protect and conserve these ecologically valuable areas. We believe that sub clause (b) is essential for maintaining the ecological health and diversity of our costal environment while ensuring responsible and sustainable land use and development practices. It aligns with our commitment to preserving the natural heritage of our region and contributing to the well being of both our communities and our unique eco-system.	Disallow		Accept in part
S399.058	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	IB-P2	Not Stated	Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement refers specifically to threatened and at risk taxa of flora and fauna as well as ecosystems and habitats. The policy as written does not specifically provide for threatened and at risk species. On that basis Policy IB-I2 is not consistent with the National Policy Statement.	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a) avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas, indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk in the New Zealand Threat Classification System lists; indigenous ecosystems and vegetation types that are threatened in the coastal environment, or are naturally		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					rare, habitats of indigenous species where the species are at the limit of their natural range, or are naturally rare, areas containing nationally significant examples of indigenous community types; and areas set aside for full or partial protection of indigenous biological diversity under other legislation, and. b) avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous species vegetation, habitats and ecosystems		
FS339.030	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	The proposed amendment assists with effecting the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S364.037	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P2	Support in part	The Director-General requests Policy IB-P2 be updated to give effect to Policy 11(a) of the NZCPS	Amend 'clause a' of Policy IB-P2 to incorporate the wording under Policy 11(a) of the NZCPS.		Accept in part
FS339.050	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	The proposed amendments ensure the PFNDP implements NZCPS Policy 11.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.1118	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
FS346.177	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1132	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
FS569.1154	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
S511.058	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P2	Oppose	RMA, s75 says a district plan must give effect to the NZCPS and the RPS. This policy is a good start, however, this policy does not give full effect to the RPS, policy 4.4.1(1). And NZCPS policy 11 For example the NZCPS, policy 11(a) and the RPS, policy 4.4.1(1)(a) requires the avoidance of adverse effects on indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at-risk. Reliance solely on the criteria may not necessarily pick these matters up. These need to be expressly listed in the plan to give full effect to the higher order documents. Also (b) only picks up one of the matters in RPS, policy 4.4.1(2) when there actually 3. Also the NZCPS, policy 11(b) lists 6 individually. A useful comparison and perhaps template is the proposed Northland Regional Plan, policy D.2.18 or the Whangarei District Plan, CA. 1.3 (4) and . This policy mirrors the RPS, policy 4.4.1. RMA, s75(4) and (5) says a district plan must not be inconsistent with a regional plan.	Amend to give full effect to RPS and the NZCPS, policy 11(a) and (b)		Accept in part
FS164.058	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.	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS404.094	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	Support the relief for the reasons given in the Forest and Bird primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1629	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
FS566.1643	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
FS569.1665	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
S454.083	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	IB-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 IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment, subject to Policy I-Px: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas; and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.		Reject
FS346.029	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS404.018	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	As the D-G opposes the submitter's relief for I-P2, the consequential amendments are also opposed	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.358	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendment to give effect to the NPSET	Allow	Amend	Reject
S356.063	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	IB-P2	Oppose	There is slight confusion and duplication in relation to IP-02 and this needs to be clarified to ensure these provisions complement and work together.	Amending as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the qualities and characteristics of Significant Natural Areas; and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems; and c. In relation to infrastructure, Policy IP2 also applies.		Reject
FS346.046	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendment sought is inconsistent with the NZCPS.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
S243.025	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.		Accept in part
FS570.583	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
FS566.597	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
FS569.619	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
S442.077	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P2	Oppose	RMA, s75 says a district plan must give effect to the NZCPS and the RPS. This policy is a good start, however, this policy does not give full effect to the RPS, policy 4.4.1(1). And NZCPS policy 11 For example the NZCPS, policy 11(a) and the RPS, policy 4.4.1(1)(a) requires the avoidance of adverse effects on indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at-risk. Reliance solely on the criteria may not necessarily pick these matters up. These need to be expressly listed in the plan to give full effect to the higher order documents. Also (b) only picks up one of the matters in RPS, policy 4.4.1(2) when there actually 3. Also the NZCPS, policy 11(b) lists 6 individually. A useful comparison and perhaps template is the proposed Northland Regional Plan, policy D.2.18 or the Whangarei District Plan, CA. 1.3 (4) and . This policy mirrors the RPS, policy 4.4.1. RMA, s75(4) and (5) says a district plan must not be inconsistent with a regional plan.	Amend to give full effect to RPS and the NZCPS, policy 11(a) and (b).		Accept in part
FS346.688	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
S167.016	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P2	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change	Amend Policy IB-P2 as follows: Within the coastal environment: a. avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and b. avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems.		
FS566.378	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S168.024	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P3	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and ...		Accept in part
S222.024	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P3	Support in part	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S463.030	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-P3	Oppose	WBF opposes the vague wording of sub-clause (b) of this policy for the same reasons given in relation to policy IB-P2.	Delete sub-clause b. of Policy IB-P3 or amend it to clarify the reference to "important and vulnerable" features		Accept in part
S364.038	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P3	Support in part	The Director-General supports the intention of Policy IB-P3, however requests an amendment to recognise and provide for the matters of national importance under section 6(c) of the RMA and to give effect to the RPS for Northland.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, ~~remedy or mitigate~~ remedy or mitigate significant adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas ~~to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor;~~ and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Accept in part
FS93.12	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Disagree with these recommendations. - We will not ensure a healthy environment by banning pets entirely. - Nor can we ensure the health of our communities and indigenous biodiversity by writing documents which add more and more control. - We have to work together to encourage everyone to get involved, in a balanced, evidence-driven manner.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS58.9	Harold Corbett		Oppose	The PDP must encourage landowners to support native flora and fauna. The change suggested by DOC will penalise landowners who effectively, through planting and pest control, create/establish/maintain/enhance an SNA. Rather, it encourages landowners to	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				minimise management and so minimise any values that could constrain any desired future use. Wording in PDP should not change.			
FS67.55	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.57	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.56	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.76	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS28.005	Dr John L Craig		Oppose	The wording change to only use the "Avoid significant effects" will penalise landowners who through planting and pest control establish and maintain an SNA. Instead, it encourages landowners to minimise management so that the area retains few values that could be affected by any desired use.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part
FS339.051	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	The proposed amendments ensure the PFNDP implement NZCPS Policy 11.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS548.092	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS354.112	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The NPSIB requires that SNA's are protected by avoiding or managing adverse effects from new subdivision use and development. The policy as notified provides for this approach.	Disallow	Disallow S364.038	Accept in part
FS570.1119	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
FS346.178	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		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	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.			of the Director General for Conservation other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.			
FS566.1133	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
FS569.1155	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
S431.092	John Andrew Riddell	IB-P3	Not Stated	Protection of indigenous biodiversity is a component of sustainable management of natural and physical resources via, for example sections 5(2)(b) and 6(c) of the Act. Further directive guidance on the protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is given by policy 11 of the Coastal Policy Statement and policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement. The proposed Plan does not give effect to these policies.	Delete Policies IB-P1, IB-P2 and IB-P3 and replace with a reproduced Policy 4.4.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		Accept in part
FS67.56	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.58	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.57	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.77	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS23.128	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.092	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
S559.021	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P3	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-P3 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part
FS151.329	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.267	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2211	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.048	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2225	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.2247	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
S399.059	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	IB-P3	Not Stated	Policy IB-3 as written does not specifically provide for threatened and at risk species of flora and fauna. These species are most at risk of adverse effects.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a) avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas and threatened and at risk indigenous species to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b) avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important ~~and vulnerable~~ indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Accept
FS339.031	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Requiring no more than minor effects on threatened or at risk native flora or fauna assists in achieving s 6(c) RMA.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
S511.059	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P3	Oppose	Many of the reasons listed for IB-P2 apply to this policy in regards to giving effect to the RPS, policy 4.4.1. This policy only partially gives effect to the RPS. A useful comparison and perhaps template is the proposed Northland Regional Plan, policy D.2.18. This policy mirrors the RPS, policy 4.4.1. RMA, s75(4) says a district plan must not be inconsistent with a regional plan.	Amend to give full effect to the RPS. Policy 4.4.1 for indigenous biodiversity outside of the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS164.059	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	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS404.095	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	As stated in the Forest and Bird primary submission the policy must give full effect to RPS policy 4.4.1 for indigenous biodiversity outside of the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1630	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
FS566.1644	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
FS569.1666	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
S276.109	Russell Landcare Trust	IB-P3	Support	Policy 4.4.1(1) of the Regional Policy Statement sets a 'no more than minor' effects regime for SNAs outside the coastal environment. The District Plan test should be consistent for such areas.	Retain policy IB-P3 which sets a 'no more than minor' effects regime for SNAs outside the coastal environment (inferred).		Accept in part
FS332.187	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 (inferred).	Accept in part
FS570.814	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
FS566.828	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
FS569.850	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
S454.084	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	IB-P3	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 IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment, subject to Policy I-Px: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Reject
FS346.030	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS404.019	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	As the D-G opposes the submitter's relief for I-P2, the consequential amendments are also opposed	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.359	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendment to give effect to the NPSET	Allow	Amend	Reject
S356.064	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	IB-P3	Oppose	There is slight confusion and duplication in relation to IP-03 and this needs to be clarified to ensure these provisions complement and work together.	Amend as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the qualities and characteristics of Significant Natural Areas to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects; and c. In relation to infrastructure, Policy IP3 also applies.		
FS346.047	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendment sought does not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c)/s31 matters	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
S243.026	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P3	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Accept in part
FS570.584	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
FS566.598	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
FS569.620	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
S442.078	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P3	Oppose	Many of the reasons listed for IB-P2 apply to this policy in regards to giving effect to the RPS, policy 4.4.1. This policy only partially gives effect to the RPS. A useful comparison and perhaps template is the proposed Northland Regional Plan, policy D.2.18. This policy mirrors the RPS, policy 4.4.1. RMA, s75(4) says a district plan must not be inconsistent with a regional plan.	Amend to give full effect to the RPS. Policy 4.4.1 for indigenous biodiversity outside of the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS346.689	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
S167.017	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P3	Oppose	Because areas of Significant Natural Area are not mapped, avoidance can only be achieved in relation to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The change proposed by this submission gives effect to the requirements of the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Policy IB-P3 as follows: Outside the coastal environment: a. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on Significant Natural Areas areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna to ensure adverse effects are no more than minor; and b. avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on areas of important and vulnerable indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems to ensure there are no significant adverse effects.		Accept in part
FS566.379	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
S416.031	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	IB-P4	Support	KiwiRail have an interest in these provisions and support the policy direction setting out the hierarchy of avoid, remedy, mitigation and offsetting in relation to environmental effects in sensitive areas.	Retain Policy IB-P4		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S542.006	Marianna Fenn	IB-P4	Support in part	Offsetting and compensation should only be available where there will be a net gain in indigenous biodiversity and it should not be seen as being available for consideration as of right Support definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation subject to amendments needed to reflect need for net gain in indigenous biodiversity	Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity; and Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain		Accept in part
FS112.11	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. IB-P4 a should be amended to (a) biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a no net loss and preferably net gain in indigenous biodiversity. Offsets should include both past and future actions.	Allow		Accept in part
FS58.12	Harold Corbett		Support in part	Offsetting must recognise past as well as future actions. Biodiversity gains from past actions must be recognised in the Offsetting rule on Additionality. Exclusion of this is another disincentive to start biodiversity positive actions now (rather than when/if a need for offsetting is realised).	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS58.13	Harold Corbett		Support	Refer IB-P4a: As per original submission, revise (a): a. biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a net gain in indigenous biodiversity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.007	Dr John L Craig		Support in part	The offsetting rule on Additionality must not be used to discount past actions by landowners that have produced biodiversity gains.	Allow in part	Amend IB-P4 as follows: 'If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems cannot be avoided...biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a no net loss and preferably net gain (which can include past actions) in indigenous biodiversity...environmental biodiversity compensation (up to a net gain) to address more than minor residual adverse effects where it is not practicable to achieve biodiversity offsetting. Amend the definitions of	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain and include past actions towards a net gain (inferred).	
S129.001	Lynley Newport	IB-P4	Support in part	The submitter supports IB-P4 and the ability to offsets but considers that offsetting should also be available in the coastal environment.	Amend IB-P4 to read: If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with IB-P2 and/or P3, consider whether it is appropriate to apply the following steps as an effects management hierarchy: (remainder unchanged)		Accept in part
FS112.12	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. Offsetting should be available to those in coastal environment, not just for areas outside of coastal environments where there is a no net loss and preferably net gain in indigenous biodiversity.	Allow		Accept in part
FS58.2	Harold Corbett		Support	Offsetting should be available in all environments. Furthermore, positive past actions by landowners should be considered as Offsets for future action. This would encourage landowners to undertake multiple positive actions for indigenous species and ecosystems without unnecessarily constraining future use.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.006	Dr John L Craig		Support	Offsetting should be available in all environments and positive past actions by landowners should be considered as Offsets for future action. This would encourage landowners to undertake multiple positive actions toward indigenous species and ecosystems without unnecessarily constraining future use.	Allow in part	Amend IB-P4 as follows: 'If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with IB-P3, consider whether it is appropriate to apply the following steps as an effects management hierarchy:	Accept in part
S442.176	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P4	Support in part	Offsetting and compensation should only be available where there will be a net gain in indigenous biodiversity and it should not be seen as being available for consideration as of right Support definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation subject to amendments needed to reflect	Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity; and Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				need for net gain in indigenous biodiversity>			
FS58.11	Harold Corbett		Support in part	Offsetting must recognise past as well as future actions. Biodiversity gains from past actions must be recognised in the Offsetting rule on Additionality. Exclusion of this is another disincentive to start biodiversity positive actions now (rather than when/if a need for offsetting is realised).	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS67.58	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB .	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.60	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB which supersedes the exposure draft referred to in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.59	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.79	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB	Disallow		Accept in part
S364.039	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P4	Support in part	The Director General supports the intention of Policy IB-P4, however requests amendments to ensure the policy incorporates the principles of the NPSIB exposure draft.	Amend Policy IB-P4 to require that any biodiversity offset, or biodiversity compensation be in accordance with the principles of Appendices 3 and 4 of NPSIB (or like principles). Insert Appendices 3 and 4 of NPSIB (or like principles)s into the Plan		Accept in part
FS67.57	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB which supersedes the exposure draft referred to in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.59	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB which supersedes the exposure draft referred to in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.58	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB which supersedes the exposure draft referred to in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.78	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The changes sought do not give effect to the NPS:IB which supersedes the exposure draft referred to in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Accept in part
S442.176	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P4	Support in part	Offsetting and compensation should only be available where there will be a net gain in indigenous biodiversity and it should not be seen as being available for consideration as of right Support definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation subject to amendments needed to reflect need for net gain in indigenous biodiversity>	Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity; and Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain.		Accept in part
FS28.008	Dr John L Craig		Support in part	The offsetting rule on Additionality must not be used to discount past actions by landowners that have produced biodiversity gains.	Allow in part	Amend IB-P4 as follows: 'If adverse effects on indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems cannot be avoided...biodiversity offsetting to address more than minor residual adverse effects to achieve a no net loss and preferably net gain (which can include past actions) in indigenous biodiversity...environmental biodiversity compensation (up to a net gain) to address more than minor residual adverse effects where it is not practicable to achieve biodiversity offsetting. Amend the definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain and include past actions towards a net gain (inferred).	Accept in part
FS346.787	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
S511.060	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P4	Neutral	Forest & Bird tentatively supports this policy but wishes to see where discussions on other policies land	Retain IB-P4		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS164.060	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
FS570.1631	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
FS566.1645	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
FS569.1667	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
S364.039	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P4	Support in part	The Director General supports the intention of Policy IB-P4, however requests amendments to ensure the policy incorporates the principles of the NPSIB exposure draft.	Amend Policy IB-P4 to require that any biodiversity offset, or biodiversity compensation be in accordance with the principles of Appendices 3 and 4 of NPSIB (or like principles). Insert Appendices 3 and 4 of NPSIB (or like principles) into the Plan		Accept in part
FS534.021	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	WBFL agrees that alignment with the NPSIB 2023 offsetting and compensation principles is desirable for regulatory consistency WBFL notes however that the distinction in IB-P4 (and IB-P2 and IB-P3) between areas in the coastal environment and areas outside the coastal environment differs to the NPSIB framework under	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				clauses 3.10 (SNAs), 3.16 (Areas outside SNAs) and 3.20 (Highly mobile fauna). The framework will require reconsideration to align with the NPSIB.			
FS570.1120	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
FS346.179	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
FS566.1134	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
FS569.1156	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
S542.006	Marianna Fenn	IB-P4	Support in part	Offsetting and compensation should only be available where there will be a net gain in indigenous biodiversity and it should not be seen as being available for consideration as of right Support definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation subject to amendments needed to reflect need for net gain in indigenous biodiversity	Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity; and Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain; and Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain		Accept in part
FS570.2134	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
FS346.869	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 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
FS566.2148	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
FS569.2170	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
S442.079	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P4	Neutral	Forest & Bird tentatively supports this policy but wishes to see where discussions on other policies land.	Retain IB-P4.		Accept in part
FS346.690	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
S182.014	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	IB-P5	Support	Support policies that do not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities	Retain Policy IB-P5		Accept in part
S282.012	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	IB-P5	Support	This policy recognises the importance as well as operational and function needs of regionally significant infrastructure at a policy level and allows for the location of such within Significant Natural Areas in some circumstances.	Retain IB-P5.		Accept in part
S333.017	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-P5	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga, marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.	
S168.025	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; ...	
S187.018	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed in support the social, economic	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					and cultural well-being of tangata associated residential units and infrastructure.	
S356.062	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	IB-P5	Support	not stated	Retain IB-P5 as notified	Accept in part
S222.025	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P5	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga,	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.		
S416.032	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	IB-P5	Support	The recognition that there are sometimes operation and functional needs for buildings and structures to be located in SNA's (and in other scheduled areas), is supported by KiwiRail. As previously noted, the rail corridor is not able to be easily relocated given its nature as a long linear transport network.	Retain Policy IB-P5		Accept in part
S331.043	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	IB-P5	Support	The submitter supports policy IB-P5 as it acknowledges the Ministry may have an operational need to provide educational facilities for existing communities in Significant Natural Areas.	Retain policy IB-P5, as proposed.		Accept in part
FS112.6	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission and agree that there is operational need to provide educational facilities for existing communities in Significant Natural Areas, and this should include, but not be limited to, development of land use where promotion of indigenous biodiversity is formed through aspects such as indigenous carbon farming and tourism.	Allow		Accept in part
FS58.8	Harold Corbett		Support	Environmental participation, awareness and education are vital to improving outcomes for biodiversity. Retain IB-P5 and expand to include: [e] does not impose unreasonable restrictions on rural land use of indigenous forest for carbon storage, biodiversity and tourism (as imagined in our submission for Tupou). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.009	Dr John L Craig		Support	The submitter agrees that there is operational need to provide educational facilities for existing communities in SNAs, and this should include, but not be limited to development of land use where promotion of indigenous biodiversity is	Allow	Retain IB-P5 as proposed.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				formed through aspects such as indigenous carbon farming and tourism.			
S364.040	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P5	Support in part	The Director-General considers that Policy IB-P5 should be amended to ensure that land use and subdivision in relation to SNAs is managed in an appropriate way. It is unclear what circumstances would meet the criteria for "unreasonable restriction". It is further considered that the "operational need" of "some activities" should not have a higher priority than SNAs.	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: ~~a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils;~~ b. recognises the ~~operational need and functional need of some activities,~~ including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within Significant Natural Areas in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga, marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.		Accept in part
FS24.39	Lynley Newport		Oppose	do not agree with the suggested changes.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.5	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The proposed changes provide a more appropriate way to manage land use and subdivision concerning SNAs.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.012	Dr John L Craig		Support in part	Provision needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou. Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and	Allow in part	Retain IB-P5 as follows 'b) recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure in some circumstances, to be located within Significant Natural Areas...e)	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development should be enabled not controlled.		allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity, and tourism...'(inferred).	
FS548.093	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers opposes the removal of the reference to existing primary production activities.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS354.113	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to delete IB-P5 a), including highly productive land. This is not supported as hpl also needs to be recognised and provided for.	Disallow	Disallow S364.040	Accept in part
FS570.1121	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
FS346.180	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
FS566.1135	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
FS569.1157	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
S442.080	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P5	Oppose	This policy is trying to do too much. It is combining the protection of SNAs elements with maintenance of other indigenous biodiversity into one policy direction. Sub policy (a) - Existing primary production areas are already cleared or highly modified so shouldn't generally be captured by the RPS SNA definition. The maintenance of biodiversity will likely be the only provisions applying. The wording of this sub-policy does not align with the wording of the other three sub-policies and	Delete in the first instance, if not deleted then amend as follows: "Ensure that the management of land use, development and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a) ~~Does not impose unreasonable restrictions on~~ Allows for existing primary production activities, to continue		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				gives primary production activities primacy over the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. There are no higher document directions indicating this should be the case. Also the term "unreasonable" is far too ambiguous. The sub-policy if it remains requires tightening up. Sub-Policy (b) and (c) are already provided for in the infrastructure and renewable energy chapters. It also gives all infrastructure primacy over indigenous biodiversity when there is no higher order direction for this Sub-policy (d) could be retained in a separate format.	particularly on highly versatile soils where the Significant Natural Areas's values are protected and indigenous biodiversity values are maintained; ...		
FS58.10	Harold Corbett		Oppose	Retain IB-P5 and expand to include: [e] does not impose unreasonable restrictions on rural land use of indigenous forest for carbon storage, biodiversity and tourism (as imagined in our submission for Tupou). Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS85.11	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	PF Olsen supports the retaining IB-P5 wording as this is consistent with the entire DP and recognised the primary production activity at the same time, enabling Maori land to be used in a way that supports social, economic and cultural well-being fulfilling the principles set in s 5 of RMA.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.691	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
S148.014	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-P5	Support	SFNZ acknowledges the statements made regarding the high proportion of the District that has potentially significant ecological values and the fact that over half of those lands are in private ownership. As noted, this creates potential tension between those seeking to protect those areas and	Retain IB-P5		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				those wishing to make reasonable economic use of their lands. It is essential that the Plan takes a pragmatic approach to protecting significant natural areas and allowing people to meet their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing by: - Ensuring there is certainty about what is or is not an SNA including drawing clear boundaries between rural production areas and SNA and ensuring there is reliable mapping of SNA across the district. - Supporting landowners with the costs of identifying and managing SNA on their lands - Avoiding unnecessary compliance costs associated with potential SNA and rural production activities.			
FS85.9	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Summit Forest's submission in retaining IB-P5 wording as this is consistent with the entire DP and recognised the primary production activity at the same time enables Maori land to be used in a way that supports social, economic and cultural well-being fulfilling the principles set in s 5 of RMA.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.011	Dr John L Craig		Support in part	Provision needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou. Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled.	Allow in part	Retain IB-P5 as follows 'b) recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure in some circumstances, to be located within Significant Natural Areas...e) allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity, and tourism...(inferred).	Accept in part
FS346.520	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
FS566.126	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
S143.005	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	IB-P5	Support	Ballance supports policies that do not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities	Retain the policy IB-P5		Accept in part
FS85.10	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports the Ballance Agri-Nutrients' submission in retaining IB-P5 wording as this is consistent with the entire DP and recognised the primary production activity at the same time, enables Maori land to be used in a way that supports social, economic and cultural well-being fulfilling the principles set in s 5 of RMA.	Allow		Accept in part
FS534.022	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with Ballance that it is appropriate for the policy to specifically provide for existing primary production activities	Allow	retain IB-P5 as notified	Accept in part
S159.051	Horticulture New Zealand	IB-P5	Support in part	Recognition of primary production and highly versatile soils is supported. However, the defined term is highly productive land which should be used in the policy	Amend section a) of Policy IB-P5, replacing the term 'highly versatile soils' with 'highly productive land'.		Accept
FS151.215	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS66.88	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	Better gives effect to the NPS: Highly Productive Land	Allow		Accept
FS570.213	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
FS566.227	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
FS569.249	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
S559.022	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P5	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our	Delete IB-P5 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.			
FS151.330	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.268	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2212	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.049	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2226	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
FS569.2248	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
S511.061	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P5	Oppose	This policy is trying to do too much. It is combining the protection of SNAs elements with maintenance of other indigenous biodiversity into one policy direction. Sub policy (a) - Existing primary production areas are already cleared or highly	Delete IB-P5 if not deleted then Amend as follows Ensure that the management of land use, development and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				modified so shouldn't generally be captured by the RPS SNA definition. The maintenance of biodiversity will likely be the only provisions applying. The wording of this sub-policy does not align with the wording of the other three sub-policies and gives primary production activities primacy over the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity. There are no higher document directions indicating this should be the case. Also the term "unreasonable" is far too ambiguous. The sub-policy if it remains requires tightening up. Sub-Policy (b) and (c) are already provided for in the infrastructure and renewable energy chapters. It also gives all infrastructure primacy over indigenous biodiversity when there is no higher order direction for this Sub-policy (d) could be retained in a separate format	maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a) ~~Does not impose unreasonable restrictions on~~ Allows for existing primary production activities, to continue ~~particularly on highly versatile soils where~~ the Significant Natural Areas's values are protected and indigenous biodiversity values are maintained;		
FS28.013	Dr John L Craig		Oppose	Provision needs to allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity and tourism as planned for Tupou. Such land use does more for indigenous biodiversity than a designation of SNA. Associated land use and development should be enabled not controlled	Disallow	Retain IB-P5 as follows 'b) recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure in some circumstances, to be located within Significant Natural Areas...e) allow for a change in rural use to indigenous forest for carbon, biodiversity, and tourism...(inferred).	Reject
FS23.254	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	The changes to the policy suggested by Forest and Bird go beyond those necessary to appropriately address the SNA and would result in a landowner not being able to make reasonable use of their property.	Disallow	Retain the notified wording or similar.	Reject
FS164.061	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	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
				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.			
FS548.155	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The policy as currently notified permits the continuation of existing, lawfully established activities while simultaneously safeguarding Significant Natural Areas and preserving indigenous biodiversity. Federated Farmers contends that this policy effectively strikes an equitable balance between the imperative of protecting and sustaining indigenous biodiversity and the necessity of appropriate land use practices.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Reject
FS404.096	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The drafting offered by Forest and Bird is clearer than the notified version.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1632	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
FS566.1646	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
FS569.1668	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
S276.006	Russell Landcare Trust	IB-P5	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the rules do not prevent incremental loss.	Amend clause B of Policy IB-P5 so that it sets the policy test for restrictions on primary production as whether they are necessary for protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.		Accept in part
FS23.081	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, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				There is a need to balance reasonable use and protection, particularly where enabling some development would better assist with protecting the balance of the land. The notified rules of the proposed plan better provide for these matters than those sought by the submitter.			
FS332.176	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
FS570.803	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
FS566.817	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
FS569.839	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
S431.102	John Andrew Riddell	IB-P5	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act.	Amend clause b of policy IB-P5 so that it sets the policy test for restrictions on primary production as whether they are necessary for protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity		Accept in part
FS23.138	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.102	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	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
				the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS404.048	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G supports the clearer and directive drafting in RPS policy 4.4.1 replacing proposed policies IB-P1 - P3, with the caveat that they also give effect to the NPS-IB, or that Policy Statement is otherwise implemented. Clause (b) of the submitter's relief is appropriate and necessary to give effect to the NPS-IB and to achieve the purpose of the Act. Clause (c) of the submitter's relief seeks to reproduce several operative Indigenous flora and fauna policies. The D-G considers 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.4.3 to be reflective of an earlier planning framework (for instance the explicit reference to Part 2 of the Act in 12.2.4.1), postdated by national direction such as the NPS-IB. Aspects of these policies remain useful, but they need an update. The D-G supports the intent of including these policies but retains scope to provide new drafting in this process. 12.2.4.10 and 12.2.4.11 are appropriate and necessary in the FND context and are supported for inclusion in the proposed plan by the D-G. 12.2.4.12, 12.2.3.13 and 12.2.14 are considered well aligned to the higher order planning framework and reflect good practice.	Allow in part	Allow subject to D-G's reasons.	Accept in part
S454.085	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	IB-P5	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 IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect Significant Natural Areas and maintain indigenous biodiversity, subject to Policy I-Px , is done in a way that:		Reject
FS346.031	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS404.020	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	As the D-G opposes the submitter's relief for I-P2, the consequential amendments are also opposed	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.360	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendment to give effect to the NPSET	Allow	Amend	Reject
S243.027	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.		
FS570.585	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
FS566.599	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
FS569.621	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
S542.007	Marianna Fenn	IB-P5	Oppose	Query how "unreasonable" will be determined for the purposes of (a). There is increasing awareness and support for the need to transform and improve practices in our agricultural sector. What might have been seen as "unreasonable" in the past may now be a minimum for being able to continue to operate. The wording of this policy may assist in holding back required progress. The current definition of "normal farming practices" has been used to avoid prosecution for disturbance of ephemeral wetlands	Amend (a) to ~~Does not impose unreasonable restrictions on~~ Allows for existing primary production activities, to continue particularly on highly versatile soils provided that Significant Natural Areas are protected and indigenous biodiversity values of the site are maintained; and Amend "farming" definition to exclude significant earthworks		Accept in part
FS570.2135	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
FS346.870	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2149	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.2171	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
S442.177	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P5	Oppose	Query how "unreasonable" will be determined for the purposes of (a). There is increasing awareness and support for the need to transform and improve practices in our agricultural sector. What might have been seen as "unreasonable" in the past may now be a minimum for being able to continue to operate. The wording of this policy may assist in holding back required progress. The current definition of "normal farming practices" has been used to avoid prosecution for disturbance of ephemeral wetlands.	Amend (a) to ~~Does not impose unreasonable restrictions on~~ Allows for existing primary production activities, to continue particularly on highly versatile soils provided that Significant Natural Areas are protected and indigenous biodiversity values of the site are maintained; and Amend "farming" definition to exclude significant earthworks.		Accept in part
FS346.788	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
S91.005	PF Olsen Limited	IB-P5	Support	Policy supported	Retain Policy IB-P5		Accept in part
FS566.094	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
S167.018	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P5	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P5 as follows: Ensure that the management of land use and subdivision to protect ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and maintain indigenous biodiversity is done in a way that: a. does not impose unreasonable restrictions on existing primary production activities, particularly on highly versatile		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					soils; b. recognises the operational need and functional need of some activities, including regionally significant infrastructure, to be located within ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna in some circumstances; c. allows for maintenance, use and operation of existing structures, including infrastructure; and d. enables Māori land to be used and developed to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, including the provision of papakāinga, marae and associated residential units and infrastructure.		
FS566.380	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S192.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	IB-P6	Support in part	Make IB-6 the very first policy. This policy is 'positive' not negative. It is 'encouraging' not discouraging. It is 'enabling' not punitive. It is the best possible way to start the suite of policies. It sets out what the Council can do for and with the landowner, not what the landowner must do. Make it even more positive and definitive by providing certainty - Council won't just 'consider' non regulatory methods, they will provide for. Relegate IB-1 to follow IB-6. This policy should refer to SUB-R6 (Environmental Benefit Subdivision) as another time/method to assess the significance of	Amend IB-P6 by making it IB-PI and by deleting the word " ~~consideration of~~ " from the preamble and simply saying: "... through the following non-regulatory methods: "		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous vegetation, potentially also SUB-R7 (Management Plan). Comment: Part of what is currently IB-1 clearly places the onus (and cost) on the person seeking to carry out indigenous vegetation clearance to identify any SNA. This is a complete reversal from the methodology promoted in the Draft District Plan which was that the Council bore the initial cost, and had in fact already paid for that work, using ratepayer funds, in mapping SNAs throughout the district. This mapping got dropped through public pressure and landowners were led to believe that SNAs were being dropped altogether. Now they will find that SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule. The Council intends to build up its Schedule and Maps through the methods listed in Policy IB-PI. There is no doubt or argument that habitat of ecological significance need to be identified and protected, it is the methodology that is in question. Is the cost going to fall entirely on a land owner? Or is there scope for shared costs between landowner and community/Council? Is all the work to map SNAs done to date (funded by ratepayers) going to be discarded? Or can that information be retained and be a readily accessible resource available to assist landowner and Council? The Council must cease and desist in its use of negative, restrictive and punitive language around protecting valuable ecological resources and instead emphasise the positive, and incentivise, to achieve the same outcome.		
S259.004	Nicole Wooster	IB-P6	Support in part	IB-P7 refers to 'support' while IB-P6 is not that clear. To get these outcomes support is required and should be provided as it's a community/country benefit at the cost of the landowner as they lose the ability for any other land use in most instances, especially	Amend wording to include 'support' in the first part and council to provide financial aid to actively manage large protected areas due to the community benefit.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				in the coastal environment. The individual landowner does not benefit as under other government regulations most of this vegetation would not qualify for carbon credits or emission offsets due to the vegetation age and the way the emission scheme is being proposed. It also means that unlike land that has been extensively farmed it can be planted to obtain carbon credits, while an SNA for example would not be allowed to be cleared to benefit from this new activity which may be the only financially viable option for marginal farm operations with reducing profits, uncertainty over future meat demand and greater regulations. Support should also be in the form of financial aid due to the community benefit, e.g an ecological fund, or help from an ecologist. Compensation in the form of support is important as reasonable use of the land no longer exists if vegetation cannot be removed and applies for large areas of your property.		
S333.018	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-P6	Support in part	As above in the reasons for the changes to the Overview section. In addition, an amendment is sought to provide a policy basis for rule SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision. This outcome gives effect to objective 3.4 and policy 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The RPS recognises at 4.4.3 that "ecologically beneficial use and development and voluntary efforts can be actively encouraged by including appropriate rules and incentives in regional and district plans". Subdivision is one such incentive - providing the necessary capital injection to enact the land use change required and establishing a community of care, and on-going obligations in respect to biodiversity.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, with priority given to Significant Natural Areas, through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of: ~~a. assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ a. Enabling subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					b. reducing or waiving resource consent application fees; c. providing, or assisting in obtaining funding from other agencies and trusts; d. sharing and helping to improve information on indigenous biodiversity; and e. working directly with iwi and hapū, landowners and community groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects.	
S168.026	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P6	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, an amendment is sought to provide a policy basis for rule SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, ~~with priority given to Significant Natural Areas~~, through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of: ~~a. assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ a. Enabling subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected...	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				This outcome gives effect to objective 3.4 and policy 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The RPS recognises at 4.4.3 that "ecologically beneficial use and development and voluntary efforts can be actively encouraged by including appropriate rules and incentives in regional and district plans". Subdivision is one such incentive - providing the necessary capital injection to enact the land use change required and establishing a community of care, and on-going obligations in respect to biodiversity.		
S187.019	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P6	Support in part	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, the following: reasons provided in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity overview section; the outcome gives effect to Objective 3.4 and 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement; and how subdivision provides necessary capital injection for on-going obligations in respect to biodiversity.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, ~~with priority given to Significant Natural Areas~~, through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of:~~a. assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ a. Enabling subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected. b. reducing or waiving resource consent application fees; c. providing, or assisting in obtaining funding from other agencies and trusts. d. sharing and helping to improve	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					information on indigenous biodiversity; and e. working directly with iwi and hapū, landowners and community groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects.	
S399.060	Te Hiku Iwi Development Trust	IB-P6	Not Stated	Priority should be given to the most rare ecosystem/habitat types. In general terms this includes coastal ecosystems and lowland ecosystems (the "lowest, flattest, warmest and driest" environments Cieraad et al 2015). Not all Significant Natural Areas include ecosystems of these types. Given that the amount of indigenous habitat across the district is large and apparently increasing (based on a comparison of the 2000 and 2020 SNA maps) and that the protection of SNAs has been controversial, we suggest Council consider undertaking or commissioning a district wide analysis of the SNA areas and other habitats already identified using publicly available databases in order to identify which types are already well protected and develop appropriate district wide priorities and protection targets which could allow development of some (generally well protected or common) SNAs (particularly on Māori land) whilst ensuring a representative and appropriate reserve network of ecosystem types across the District to protect and maintain the districts indigenous biodiversity.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, with priority given to Significant Natural Areas in lowland or coastal areas , through non-regulatory methods including consideration of: a) assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a high priority Significant Natural Area; ...	Reject
S511.062	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P6	Support in part	Non-regulatory methods are supported but also need district wide mapping and rules around SNA protection	Amend IB-P6 to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods. Amend to include reference to consideration of nature based solutions to mitigating the effects of climate change e.g wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects. Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					pest and weed control in place or where maintenance/enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetland establishment to mitigate flood risk to the wider area.		
FS95.008	Northland Fish and Game Council		Support	Support the proposed amendments to include nature based non-regulatory solutions/methods.	Allow	Amend as sought by submission point S511.062	Reject
FS93.18	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. - My rates should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to. - The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring/policing areas of high wildlife density.	Disallow		Accept
FS88.54	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Agree in principle. Do not agree to a waiver of rates, only a reduction. Do not agree to banning of companion animals or rate relief to those who do. Support protection of areas which provide significant ecosystem services, especially around mitigating flood risk which is clearly an increasing risk.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS164.062	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	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
				beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS570.1633	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
FS566.1647	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
FS569.1669	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
S128.002	Lynley Newport	IB-P6	Support in part	Make IB-6 the very first policy. This policy is 'positive' not negative. It is 'encouraging' not discouraging. It is 'enabling' not punitive. It is the best possible way to start the suite of policies. It sets out what the Council can do for and with the landowner, not what the landowner must do. Make it even more positive and definitive by providing certainty - Council won't just 'consider' non regulatory methods, they will provide for. The Council must cease and desist in its use of negative, restrictive and punitive language around protecting valuable ecological resources and instead emphasise the positive, and incentivise, to achieve the same outcome.	Amend Policy IB-P6 by making it IB-P1 and by deleting the word "consideration of" from the preamble and simply saying:"... through the following non-regulatory methods:". In summary, to be reworded as follows: <i>Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, with priority given to Significant Natural Areas, through the following non-regulatory methods including consideration of ...</i>		Reject
FS112.9	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. There should be more emphasis on policies that encourage and enable landowners to carry out the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, therefore IB-P6 should take priority.	Allow		Reject
FS58.1	Harold Corbett		Support	Prioritises IB-P6	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.80	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow in part		Reject
FS28.015	Dr John L Craig		Support	IB-P6 is a positive and enabling policy that should lead the negative policies that come before it. The non-regulatory methods should include support for commercial and non-commercial management that enhances indigenous biodiversity and informs others on appropriate methods for such actions.	Allow	Amend IB-P6 to be IB-P1 and as follows 'Encourage the protection, maintenance, and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, with priority given to Significant Natural Areas, through the following non-regulatory methods.'	Reject
S364.041	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P6	Support in part	The Director-General supports the intention of Policy IB-P6, however, the current wording of the policy is considered limiting. Both "Threatened" and "At Risk" species should be captured under this policy in line with the New Zealand Threat Classification System (2007). Lists of "Threatened" and "At Risk" species in the Far North also include plants that would not be affected by the presence of cats, dogs and mustelids. The term 'fauna' more appropriately recognises the intent of this policy.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to ~~threatened indigenous species~~ At Risk or Threatened indigenous fauna , including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.		Accept in part
FS93.13	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	Beginning in 2021, we polled our members as below: In your view, if you move into, or live in, a town or zone where there are many weka or kiwi present, whether or not they were always there or have been actively released there, what rules or restrictions should there be in relation to dogs? The top responses (of 646 votes) give an indication of the kinds of restrictions that dog owners consider acceptable: 19% - Fencing required 17% - Dogs must be registered and micro-chipped 11% - More frequent checks by dog control officers in such areas 11% - Don't release ground dwelling endangered birds in or near urban areas. 9% - Require dogs to be neutered or spayed 7% - Dogs must be indoors at night	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.59	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Support the change in wording to "fauna". Submit: Remove "and pets" from the following sentence and add "wild" to read: "including avoiding the introduction of wild pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas."	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS88.60	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	Highly productive land IS of national importance. It is essential for New Zealand's food security.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS225.2	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The amended policy provides direction to reduce risk to at-risk and vulnerable fauna.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1122	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
FS346.181	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
FS566.1136	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
FS569.1158	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
S148.015	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-P6	Support	SFNZ acknowledges the statements made regarding the high proportion of the District that has potentially significant ecological values and the fact that over half of those lands are in private ownership. As noted, this creates potential tension between those seeking to protect those areas and those wishing to make reasonable economic use of their lands. It is essential that the Plan takes a pragmatic approach to protecting significant natural areas and	Retain IB-P6		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				allowing people to meet their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing by: - Ensuring there is certainty about what is or is not an SNA including drawing clear boundaries between rural production areas and SNA and ensuring there is reliable mapping of SNA across the district. - Supporting landowners with the costs of identifying and managing SNA on their lands - Avoiding unnecessary compliance costs associated with potential SNA and rural production activities.			
FS85.12	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZ's submission to retain IB-P6, and the vision that the Plan approaches in balancing economic values with the protection of SNA is consistent with Part 2 of RMA.	Allow		Accept in part
FS346.521	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
FS566.127	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
S436.033	Northland Fish and Game Council	IB-P6	Support	For the reasons set out under 'general submissions 'wetlands' of the submission (refer to submission points S436.001 and S436.002), NFGC strongly support Policy IB-P6 - especially in regards to reducing or waiving resource consent application fees.	Retain Policy IB-P6		Accept in part
FS85.13	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports submission to retain IB-P6, and the vision that the Plan approaches in balancing economic values with the protection of SNA is consistent with Part 2 of RMA.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1497	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
FS346.119	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1511	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
FS569.1533	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
S442.081	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P6	Support in part	Non-regulatory methods are supported but also need district wide mapping and rules around SNA protection.	Amend IB-P6 to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods. Amend to include reference to consideration of nature based solutions to mitigating the effects of climate change e.g wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects. Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance/enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetland establishment to mitigate flood risk to the wider area.		Reject
FS85.14	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	PF Olsen supports the retention of the rule IB-P6 as has been drafted. There is no need to include any more unnecessary wording that would cause confusion. Besides, the Plan approaches in balancing economic values with the protection of SNA is consistent with Part 2 of RMA.	Disallow		Accept
FS346.692	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S559.023	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P6	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-P6 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part
FS85.15	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	PF Olsen supports the retention of the rule IB-P6 as has been drafted.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS151.331	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.269	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2213	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.050	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2227	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.2249	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
S222.026	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P6	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, an amendment is sought to provide a policy basis for rule SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision. This outcome gives effect to objective 3.4 and policy 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The RPS recognises at 4.4.3 that "ecologically beneficial use and development and voluntary efforts can be actively encouraged by including appropriate rules and incentives in regional and district plans". Subdivision is one such incentive - providing the necessary capital injection to	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, ~~with priority given to Significant Natural Areas~~, through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of:~~a. assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ a. Enabling subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected. b. reducing or waiving resource consent application fees; c. providing, or assisting in obtaining funding from other agencies and trusts; d. sharing and helping to improve information on indigenous biodiversity; and e. working directly with iwi and hapū, landowners and community groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				enact the land use change required and establishing a community of care, and on-going obligations in respect to biodiversity.			
FS534.023	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	WBFL agrees with the general proposition that developments that promote improved indigenous biodiversity outcomes should be supported, albeit "enabling" (which signals a permitted activity status) is not the most appropriate term to use in the context of subdivision proposals	Allow	amend policy IB-P6	Accept in part
S243.028	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P6	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, an amendment is sought to provide a policy basis for rule SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision. This outcome gives effect to objective 3.4 and policy 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The RPS recognises at 4.4.3 that "ecologically beneficial use and development and voluntary efforts can be actively encouraged by including appropriate rules and incentives in regional	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, ~~with priority given to Significant Natural Areas~~, through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of: a. ~~assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ Enabling subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected. b. reducing or waiving resource consent application fees; c. providing, or assisting in obtaining funding from other agencies and trusts; d. sharing and helping to improve information on indigenous biodiversity; e. working directly with iwi and hapū,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and district plans". Subdivision is one such incentive - providing the necessary capital injection to enact the land use change required and establishing a community of care, and on-going obligations in respect to biodiversity.	landowners and community groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects.		
FS570.586	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
FS566.600	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
FS569.622	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
S542.008	Marianna Fenn	IB-P6	Support in part	Regulatory methods that include district wide mapping of SNAs is also required Consideration of nature based solutions and rates relief in return for biodiversity protection and enhancement	Amend to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods ; and Amend to include reference to encouraging nature based solutions for mitigating natural hazards and the effects of climate change e.g creating wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects; and Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance / enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetlands or afforestation to mitigate flood risk for a wider catchment.		Reject
FS570.2136	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
FS346.871	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2150	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
FS569.2172	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
S442.178	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P6	Support in part	Regulatory methods that include district wide mapping of SNAs is also required Consideration of nature based solutions and rates relief in return for biodiversity protection and enhancement.	Amend to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods ; and Amend to include reference to encouraging nature based solutions for mitigating natural hazards and the effects of climate change e.g creating wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects; and Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance / enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetlands or afforestation to mitigate flood risk for a wider catchment.		Reject
FS346.789	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
S91.006	PF Olsen Limited	IB-P6	Support	Policy supported	Retain Policy IB-P6		Accept in part
FS566.095	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
S167.019	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P6	Support in part	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. An amendment is sought to provide a policy basis for rule SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.	Amend Policy IB-P6 as follows: Encourage the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity, with priority given to Significant Natural Areas , through both regulatory and non-regulatory methods including consideration of: ~~a. assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a Significant Natural Area;~~ a. Enabling		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				This outcome gives effect to objective 3.4 and policy 4.4.2 of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.	subdivision and land use where that results in the restoration or enhancement of indigenous biodiversity, including under-represented ecosystems, and where biodiversity is increased and legally protected. b. reducing or waiving resource consent application fees; c. providing, or assisting in obtaining funding from other agencies and trusts; d. sharing and helping to improve information on indigenous biodiversity; and e. working directly with iwi and hapū, landowners and community groups on ecological protection and enhancement projects.		
FS566.381	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
S143.006	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	IB-P7	Support	Ballance supports policies that actively support and provide for the management of pest plants and pest animals to enhance biodiversity values	Retain the policy IB -P7		Accept in part
S182.015	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	IB-P7	Support in part	support policies that actively provide for the management of pest plants and pest animals to enhance biodiversity values	Amend Policy IB-P7		Accept in part
S254.004	Heather Golley	IB-P7	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna,	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.	Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.		
FS88.13	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS93.50	Leonie M Exel		Support		Allow		Reject
FS88.32	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS275.49	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	Policy IB-P7 lacks clarity - there seems to be no definition of what constitutes a "pest animal" - on that basis it is likely the policy is unenforceable.	Allow		Reject
S542.009	Marianna Fenn	IB-P7	Support	Consideration should be given to providing rates relief and other incentives to encourage landowners to control weeds and animal pests on their land	Amend to include reference to potential incentives that could be provided		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS93.44	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	• I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.' • Dogs are never 'pests.' They are pets, and are our family. • Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats - they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet. • Research shows that killing colony/community cats leads to a 'vacuum effect' where other cats take up that space. If you trap, neuter and return, those neutered cats 'hold' the space and stop other cats from entering. Over time, this reduces the number of cats in an area better than killing them all outright. • I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member. • I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to. • The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.45	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	I agree with rates relief and other incentives to encourage landowners to control weeds and some pests on their land. I do NOT support paying people to kill or ban our pets on their properties. Kill traps should not be used on any animal who could be a family member. This applies mostly in relation to cats. You cannot tell if a cat is "owned", stray or feral while it is in a trap. There must be a law that states all need to be checked by a vet (or someone else qualified who is not involved in pest control) and scanned for a microchip before he/she is killed. Research has shown that trap, neuter and released colony cats keep feral cats from moving into that space. Killing them creates a vacuum that will be filled by feral cats (the same as possum removal does). Better that these cats are let to live and keep sentinel in these spaces. They are fed and not reproducing, and therefore less likely to cause problems than feral cats. I've been horrified at the attitude of some people in Northland who think it is ok to kill people's loved family members. I've not come across this attitude before, and it makes me fearful for my cats. I don't support people gaining financial benefit through rates relief for banning and killing pets, who in my opinion are essential to the mental health of so many people, including myself, and who deserve far better in their own right.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS570.2137	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
FS346.872	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB.	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.			Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS566.2151	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
FS569.2173	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
S159.052	Horticulture New Zealand	IB-P7	Support in part	Recognition of the need for management of pest plants and pest animals is supported, however the terms are not defined. It should be clear that these include pests under the Regional Pest Management Plan and unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993. This would provide the policy framework to support rules providing for biosecurity.	Amend Policy IB-P7 as follows: ~~Encourage and support active management of pest plants and pest animals.~~ Provide for the active management of pest plants and pest animals including those identified in the Regional Pest Management Plan and unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.		Accept in part
FS109.10	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	The amended policy sought provides clarity	Allow		Accept in part
FS151.216	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS151.217	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS534.024	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	It is appropriate to provide for active management of pests, particularly those that are identified in statutory instruments. WBFL considers that the proposed Plan should apply minimal regulatory friction to pest control activities.	Allow	Amend Policy IB-P7	Accept in part
FS346.006	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendment sought makes the policy clearer	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.						
FS570.214	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
FS566.228	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
FS569.250	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
S354.020	The BOI Watchdogs	IB-P7	Oppose	Dogs are not pests and should not be considered that by the Plan.	Amend this policy so that it does not apply to dogs (inferred).		Reject
FS275.50	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	Policy IB-P7 lacks clarity - there seems to be no definition of what constitutes a "pest animal" - on that basis it is likely the policy is unenforceable.	Allow		Reject
FS570.1029	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
FS566.1043	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
FS569.1065	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
S364.042	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-P7	Support in part	The Director-General considers control is a more appropriate wording here as management can also relate to biodiversity assets.	Amend Policy IB-P7 as follows: Encourage and support active ~~management~~ control of pest plants and pest animals.		Accept
FS570.1123	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
FS346.182	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		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	Allow	Allow 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.			other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Bird's submission.			
FS566.1137	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
FS569.1159	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
S529.134	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-P7	Support		Retain IB-P7		Accept in part
FS570.2022	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2036	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2058	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.179	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P7	Support	Consideration should be given to providing rates relief and other incentives to encourage landowners to control weeds and animal pests on their land.	Amend to include reference to potential incentives that could be provided.		Reject
FS346.790	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
S527.010	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-P7	Support	not stated	Retain IB-P7 as drafted (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1872	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S511.063	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	IB-P8	Support in part	Eco sourcing of native plants extremely important to protect variations in species genetics	Amend IB-P8 Promote Assist with protections of Promote the protection of species that are endemic		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand				to Northland by promoting, supporting and using eco-sourced plants from within the ecological district		
FS164.063	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
FS570.1634	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
FS566.1648	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
FS569.1670	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
S529.135	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-P8	Support		Retain IB-P8		Accept in part
FS570.2023	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2037	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2059	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S542.010	Marianna Fenn	IB-P8	Support in part	Eco sourcing is important to protect variations in species genetics	Amend ~~the protection of~~ Assist with protection of ~~Promote~~ species that are endemic to Northland by promoting, supporting and using eco-sourced plants from within the ecological district		Accept
FS570.2138	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
FS346.873	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.2152	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
FS569.2174	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
S442.082	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P8	Support in part	Eco sourcing of native plants extremely important to protect variations in species genetics.	Amend: ~~the protection of~~ Assist with protections of ~~Promote~~ species that are endemic to Northland by promoting, supporting and using eco-sourced plants from within the ecological district.		Accept
FS346.693	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
S442.180	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P8	Support in part	Eco sourcing is important to protect variations in species genetics.	Amend: ~~the protection of~~ Assist with protection of ~~Promote~~ species that are endemic		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					to Northland by promoting, supporting and using eco-sourced plants from within the ecological district"		
FS346.791	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
S527.011	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-P8	Support	not stated	Retain IB-P8 as drafted (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1873	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S77.009	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".		Reject
S146.010	Trevor John Ashford	IB-P9	Oppose	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.		
S48.001	Paul O'Connor	IB-P9	Support in part	making owners carry out pest control while excepting DOC from this responsibility is unfair and unworkable given DOC own the majority of land often adjacent to private blocks. Many lot owners already carry out pest control and this should be encouraged	Amend IB-P9 remove the word 'require' and replace with the 'assist' in this rule	Reject
S40.010	Martin John Yurelich	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from Rule IB-R9 and replace it with the word "assist".	Reject
S41.010	Joel Vieviorka	IB-P9	Oppose	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up	Delete the word "require" from Rule IB-R9 and replace it with the word "assist".	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.		
S163.013	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject
S377.010	Rua Hatu Trust	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject
S410.010	Kerry-Anne Smith	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.		
S411.010	Roger Myles Smith	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject
S470.010	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.		
S161.009	Shanon Garton	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject
S348.008	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. While they are exempt from paying rates, they should not be exempt from the responsibilities of the community in this regard. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, while a lot of DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition, and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from Rule IB-P9 and replace it with the word "assist".	Reject
S395.010	Sean Jozef Vercammen	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist"	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.		
S472.047	Michael Foy	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	amend to Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".	Reject
S547.010	LJ King Limited	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist".	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S544.010	Kelvin Richard Horsford	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist"	Reject
S439.010	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word " ~~require~~ " from Policy IB-P9 and replace the word with " assist ". Note: If you want to retain the word "require", either enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.	Reject
S310.008	Lianne Kennedy	IB-P9	Oppose	Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them. I oppose responsible pet owners being penalised unfairly regarding dogs and cats on their property. A land use consent can have a kiwi condition added yet a property recently subdivided and for sale in the same area can say 'animal friendly' presumably with no kiwi condition. Irresponsible pet owners are going to be noncompliant whatever condition is applied	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and encouragement rather than a ban will be more effective i.e. reduced dog registration fees for dogs with kiwi aversion certificate.			
FS257.1	Amber Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS297.1	Wilson Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.30	Leonie M Exel		Support	I support Lianne's submission to halt the dog bans and restrictions via sub-division. I do not support kiwi aversion training and the use of the electric shock collar has been banned overseas, for sound reasons.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS88.27	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Same reasons as for submission 309.008	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS100.43	Allen Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.1	Danielle Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.42	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.907	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
FS566.921	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
FS569.943	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
S261.008	Amber Hookway	IB-P9	Oppose	Opposes responsible pet owners being penalised unfairly regarding dogs and cats on their property. A landuse consent can have a kiwi condition added yet a property recently subdivided and for sale in the	Delete Policy (inferred). Stop the blanket banning of pets in the Far North. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				same area can say "animal friendly" presumably with no kiwi condition. Irresponsible pet owners are going to be noncompliant whatever condition is applied and encouragement rather than a ban will be more effective ie) reduction in registration fee for dogs who have a current kiwi aversion certificate. The Northern Advocate published an article 13/10/22 stating "Northland's kiwi population now in good health, NRC says" The North Island brown kiwi population in Northland is now in good health thanks to the conservation efforts of landowners and communities over many years. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them.			
FS297.11	Wilson Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS88.37	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Same reason as for 309.008	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS100.44	Allen Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.11	Danielle Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.11	Amber Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.43	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
S264.008	Wilson Hookway	IB-P9	Oppose	Opposes responsible pet owners being penalised unfairly regarding dogs and cats on their property A landuse consent can have a kiwi condition added yet a property recently subdivided and for sale in the same area can say "animal friendly" presumably with no kiwi condition. Irresponsible pet owners are going to be noncompliant whatever condition is applied	Delete Policy (inferred). Stop the blanket banning of pets in the Far North. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and encouragement rather than a ban will be more effective ie) reduction in registration fee for dogs who have a current kiwi aversion certificate. The Northern Advocate published an article 13/10/22 stating "Northland's kiwi population now in good health, NRC says" The North Island brown kiwi population in Northland is now in good health thanks to the conservation efforts of landowners and communities over many years. Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them.			
FS297.12	Wilson Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS88.38	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Same as for 309.008	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS100.45	Allen Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS275.47	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	Policy IB-P9 is far too discretionary - the "require" to manage has no protocols or guidelines to it - hence it is likely the policy is unenforceable.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS293.12	Danielle Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.12	Amber Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.44	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
S309.008	Danielle Hookway	IB-P9	Oppose	Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them. I oppose responsible pet owners being penalised unfairly regarding dogs and cats on their property. A land use consent can have a kiwi condition added yet a property recently subdivided and for sale in the same area can say 'animal friendly' presumably with no kiwi condition.	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Irresponsible pet owners are going to be noncompliant whatever condition is applied and encouragement rather than a ban will be more effective i.e. reduced dog registration fees for dogs with kiwi aversion certificate.			
FS297.13	Wilson Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.28	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	100% agree with no dog bans or ownership restrictions via sub-division consents across our region. Research shows that kiwi avoidance training is ineffective. It also uses electric shock collars which have been banned in multiple countries worldwide. The three most effective means to reduce wandering dogs are community education, de-sexing of dogs, and effective policing of irresponsible dog owners.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS88.25	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Completely agree blanket bans are inappropriate and there are better options for keeping kiwi safe from dogs. A reduced registration fee for making efforts to do so is a good idea. I'm not sure about kiwi aversion training - I don't know enough about it's sucessfulness or humaness. I would, however, be willing to put my dog through it to keep kiwi safe and keep my dog.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS100.46	Allen Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS275.48	Peter and Donna Brown		Support in part	Policy IB-P9 is far too discretionary - the "require" to manage has no protocols or guidelines to it - hence it is likely the policy is unenforceable.	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.13	Danielle Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS257.13	Amber Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.45	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
S311.008	Allen Hookway	IB-P9	Oppose	Every week people are trying to rehome their animals as they cannot get rentals with them. I oppose responsible pet owners being penalised unfairly regarding dogs and cats on their property. A land use consent can have a kiwi condition added yet a property recently subdivided and for sale in the same area can say 'animal friendly' presumably with no kiwi condition. Irresponsible pet owners are going to be noncompliant whatever condition is applied and encouragement rather than a ban will be more effective i.e. reduced dog registration fees for dogs with kiwi aversion certificate.	Amend IB-P9 so that it does not infer a blanket banning of pets in the Far North (inferred).		Accept in part
FS297.14	Wilson Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.29	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	Agree with NO MORE dog bans or restrictions in sub-divisions. Do not agree with kiwi avoidance training as a pre-requisite for living in kiwi areas, as it has been shown to be ineffective, and uses shock collars. Aversive techniques are more likely to extinguish than reward-based techniques for dogs.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS88.26	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Same reasons as for submission 309.008	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS100.47	Allen Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.14	Danielle Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS257.14	Amber Hookway		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions relating to dogs and cats particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.46	Lianne Kennedy		Support	Transparency needed around "kiwi" conditions particularly on landuse consents	Allow		Accept in part
S542.011	Marianna Fenn	IB-P9	Support in part	Support a requirement to manage domestic pets. Need to also include livestock (pigs, goats, cattle, etc.) as they can be very destructive to habitat for threatened species. The requirements should also extend to land occupiers. Further limits and conditions on pet ownership and a requirement for pest and weed control could be imposed in the context of a consent for subdivision or development	Amend to require management and (where appropriate) limits on the numbers of domestic pets and livestock for landowners and land occupiers; and Amend to clarify that further limits and pest and weed control will be considered when possible and appropriate		Reject
FS93.9	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Livestock are catered for under the Animals bylaw. This expired some years ago and is only now being re-drafted by FNDC. That is the appropriate document to regulate livestock, not the RMA. - Bans and restrictions via subdivision consents has not worked for over two decades, and is an ineffective means of reducing predation on wildlife. It over-regulates responsible dog owners, and under-regulates irresponsible dog owners. It creates mistrust between council and residents, and mistrust between dog owners and conservation experts. - These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' - The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions. - To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate, and frankly, sneaky. - The elected council of FNDC chose NOT	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to restrict or limit 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.			
FS88.46	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	Strongly disagree. The Dog Control Act 1999 is the means to control troublesome dogs, not the District Plan or the RMA. The numbers of dogs on a property is irrelevant. It is how they are managed by their "owners" that creates either a nuisance or not. The authorities (FNDC Animal Management, SPCA, MPI, and police) have the power to manage nuisance animals of any species. Avoiding this task by simply banning animals is lazy and very unfair to law abiding, animal loving people, and to the animals themselves. There is no need to punish people (and animals) by disallowing them to love and care for as many animals as they are willing to.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2139	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
FS346.874	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2153	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
FS569.2175	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
S507.001	Kate Burdekin	IB-P9	Support in part	We need to improve the lives of neglected dogs in the Far North. The Council are making it so difficult for people in the Far North to achieve their dream of owning a dog. There are so many properties now that have a no dog covenant on it, or by introducing SNAs on land and encouraging people to take out conservation covenants, meaning no companion animals can be kept, in return for reduced rates. Many dog owners care for all animals / birds and love nature. Especially in the Far North where many of us have chosen to live in a rural community. There needs to be a change in attitude towards dog owners and kiwi protection.	Amend wording so that pets and pests are not used in the same breath. Rather than an overall ban on dogs, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions - fenced garden, animals to be kept inside at night (this also ensures their safety), no dogs to be chained and must be adequately cared for, and encourage dog owners to get involved in protecting kiwis. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs and kiwi can live side by side.		Reject
FS93.21	Leonie M Exel		Support	Councillors - the summaries of our submissions do not and cannot give the full picture about dog bans and restrictions. Please read these 3 submissions on dogs in FULL - Kate Burdekin, Stephanie Lane, and BOI Watchdogs. Then you will understand the research, the history, and the community angst. Those 3 submissions contain all the solutions that we need to bring our community together, dog lovers and conservationists and council. Kate was one of the founding members of the Watchdogs, and put years into working towards the betterment of dog welfare in Northland. She has a thorough understanding of these issues, has worked as a vet nurse, and volunteers with the Rolands Woods trust. Her views are very well informed, and I fully support them.	Allow		Reject
FS88.11	Stephanie Lane		Support	Agree 100%. Animal lovers are more likely to care for kiwi and more likely to have	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				dogs. Let's work together to protect kiwi and not exacerbate the extreme unwanted dog (and cat) population and poor mental health by making people give up their family members to overcrowded pounds and rescues.			
FS88.75	Stephanie Lane		Support	1. Agree that it is difficult for ordinary people to match the long technical responses from the professional submission writers employed by entities such as DOC, Forest & Bird, Kiwis for Kiwis etc. Submit: That this is taken into account during consideration and decision making. 2. Variety of socio-economic groups. "Rather than the council concentrating on creating rules for controlling where the well looked after dogs can or can't live and walk... the council put its energy into helping improve the life of the neglected dogs in our community." Submit: I don't know how this affects the DP but makes a lot of sense. Submitter's "few ideas" are excellent. Submit that council consider putting some into action. 3. "A well run pound is required as a matter of urgency. One where animal welfare is paramount....People no longer leave their dogs in the garden when they go out for fear of their dog being stolen." Submit: The pound is still not being run humanely, even after all these years. This needs to be addressed urgently. I concur with not leaving dogs in the yard when I go out. I have a large lockable kennel with run but I never use it anymore. I crate my dogs inside to keep them safe when I'm away from home. 4. FNDC encouraging people to take out conservation covenants, meaning no companion animals can be kept, in return	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for reduced rates. Submit: This stops immediately. It is sneaky tactics. It is giving people financial incentive to accept and aid the anti-dog agenda. Agree with reduced rates for environmental protection efforts, but not when it bans companion animals. Agree with reasonable measures required to protect kiwi while allowing our companion animals to live and visit there. 5. "Personally know people who have chosen to avoid Northland due to its dog unfriendliness. " These people will be the law abiding, productive members of society, and would be of great value to Northland but we lose them due to animal bans. Submit: Allow - "rather than an overall ban, put covenants in place allowing ownership of companion animals under certain conditions. Submit: This be taken into strong consideration while deciding on dog bans. 6." What controls are in place in the Council to ensure that a long term plan is for the good of the whole community rather than a small group's view?" Submit: That this information be made public and easily accessible, as there seems to be a strong push for blanket pet banning that does not take into account the welfare of our own people. 7. "The council needs to work on accessing more walking tracks where dogs, and people, can get out for long walks. Rolands Wood is amazing but this is looked after by a Trust not the Council. The track between Opuia & Paihia is a perfect example of how well it can work. There are numerous DOC tracks that would be perfect dog walking tracks. There are			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				many areas in New Zealand where DOC allow access to dogs - just seems in the too hard basket for the Far North DOC department. Can the Council liaise with DOC to identify tracks that could be opened up for dog walkers?" Submit: Strongly support this. More people should be able to access and enjoy our beautiful places. They belong to us all. People who enjoy nature are far more likely to care about nature, and therefore contribute to its protection. When they don't know it exists, or don't understand it, or haven't experienced it, they will not value it. 8. "Dog tourism - BOI cafes that welcome dogs on a Sunday morning - they are packed" Submit: Support in part. I don't know that dog tourism is necessarily right for Northland, but I do know that simply allowing and welcoming dogs will increase our tourism (and therefore revenue), so I submit we make Northland accessible to dog tourism even if we don't aim for it specifically. Remember, people who bring their dogs on holiday with them love and care for their dogs. They don't just let them run wild to kill kiwi. Good signage and education on how to behave with dogs in kiwi areas would work for these people. 9. Kiwi conservation "There seems to be a misconception that you can either be a conservationist or a dog owner, but not both. This is so wrong. Many dog owners care for all animals / birds and love nature. If you look at the statistics, there are very few kiwi deaths by dogs yet dogs are portrayed as the main killer of kiwis. There are so many			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				kiwi deaths by being run over but little is being done to reduce traffic speed or warn drivers in high kiwi population areas. The Council themselves are a major disruption of the kiwi population by allowing big subdivisions to happen, thus clearing the habitat where the kiwi's live. The oxymoron being that the houses on that subdivision will then have a no dog clause in order to protect the kiwis!" Submit: 100% agree. I am a dog owner and a conservationist, and always have been. As said in this submission, there is no actual reason dogs are being targeted while the other causes of kiwi deaths ignored. This smacks of one-sided lobbying and lazy council politics. It is wrong to make bans that negatively affect half of the people living here while ignoring the other issues around kiwi conservation. 10. "Encourage dog owners to join rat & stoat trapping programs - currently put off as dogs are demonised as being a pest. The council needs to look at its own attitude to encourage this change in mind set. The wording in the Long Term Plan refers to pets and pests in the same breath. Maybe a campaign with positive ideas how dogs & kiwi can live side by side." Submit: Collaboration would be so much more effective than division. Dog walkers could easily help out with trapping programs while exercising their dogs. Using pets and pests in the same breath contributes to the abhorrent attitude to animals rife in Northland. We have a shocking animal welfare crisis in Northland			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and council should be trying to resolve this, not contribute to it.			
S358.042	Leah Frieling	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. While they are exempt from paying rates, they should not be exempt from the responsibilities of the community in this regard. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, while a lot of DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition, and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Amend Policy IB-P9 as follows: ~~Require~~ Assist landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas. OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.		Reject
FS93.32	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	Agree 100% that DOC needs to focus on getting 'their' land pest free before demanding others do likewise. • I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.' • Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats - they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet. • I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member. • I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to. • The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!			
FS88.28	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Agree to the change of "require" to "assist" Submit that "pets and" be removed from the following sentence. "...including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas."	Allow in part		Reject
S148.017	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-P9	Oppose	SFNZ acknowledges the statements made regarding the high proportion of the District that has potentially significant ecological values and the fact that over half of those lands are in private ownership. As noted, this creates potential tension between those seeking to protect those areas and those wishing to make reasonable economic use of their lands. It is essential that the Plan takes a pragmatic approach to protecting significant natural areas and allowing people to meet their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing by: - Ensuring there is certainty about what is or is not an SNA including drawing clear boundaries between rural production areas and SNA and ensuring there is reliable mapping of SNA across the district. - Supporting landowners with the costs of identifying and managing SNA on their lands - Avoiding unnecessary compliance costs associated with potential SNA and rural	Amend IB-P9 to read "Support landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, ..." Or words of like effect.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				production activities. Without significant support from the Council B-P9 is potentially onerous			
FS93.33	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	• I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.' • Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats - they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet. • I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member. • I do not support the provision of rates relief for people who ban or restrict dogs and cats in perpetuity either via conservation covenants, or sub-division processes. My money should not go towards something I find repugnant, and something I have not had a chance to object to. • The cost of rates relief in the 20/21 year, for covenants which ban our pets, was \$79,000+ for NRC and \$584,000+ for FNDC. Think of all the extra Animal Management Officers we could hire for that, to work on community education, and monitoring areas of high wildlife density!	Disallow		Accept
FS88.76	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Support, but submit that distinction between pets and pests be made, and ensure no bans on companion animals are involved.	Allow in part		Reject
FS346.523	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)	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.			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.			
FS566.129	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
S518.001	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated	IB-P9	Support in part	Residents in the district are very protective of the Kiwi population and most see roaming dogs and cats as a real threat. Unfortunately, some don't recognise that their own pets can be a threat to native species. Neighbours need to be aware of landowner's efforts to control pests on their properties and the need to keep their pets on their own properties. We note that in some areas pigs are a real threat especially in spring when the pigs will root up whole kiwifruit blocks even during the day.	Amend IB-P9 as follows: 'Require landowners to manage pets and pest species on their own land , including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.'		Accept in part
FS93.34	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	- I DO NOT support dogs or cats ever being named in the same paragraph as 'pests.' - Cats in this context are feral cats. Domestic and colony/community cats, which are often dumped, need to be excluded from any provision referring to them. Kill traps MUST not be used for feral cats - they must be live traps, and taken to be checked for microchips at a vet. - I have had countless people express their horror at neighbours who shoot or trap cats, ignoring whether they are feral or domestic much-loved fur kids. This has happened in Russell, where zealots think they can get away with shooting cats. It is a terrible thing to do, to kill someone's family member. - Please use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly. - The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs,	Disallow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs. - When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time. - These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work!			
FS88.81	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	I disagree that most residents see dogs and cats as a real threat to kiwi. Some do, most understand that dogs and cats are not the only, or even main, threat to kiwi. Cars and subdivisions are. The numbers of kiwi known by DOC to have been killed in Northland, over a 2.5 year period: 2019: car - 21; dog - 20; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 1 2020: car - 20; dog - 13; cat - 0; cat or stoat - 0 2021 (to June): car - 12; dog - 9; cat - 0; cat or stoat or unknown - 2 Of the dogs who have killed kiwi, few if any were under supervision at the time. Comparing the number of dogs in Northland to the few (though clearly not insignificant) numbers of kiwi, shows that most dogs live here without killing kiwi and banning them is not the answer. Submit: No dog bans	Disallow		Accept
FS151.32	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
S254.001	Heather Golley	IB-P9	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna, significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.	documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.		
FS88.14	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS93.51	Leonie M Exel		Support	For some reason, Heather Golley's summarised submission has been repeated 5 times? not sure why	Allow		Reject
FS88.33	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
S541.010	Elbury Holdings	IB-P9	Oppose	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist".		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.			
FS155.50	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
S485.011	Elbury Holdings	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".		Reject
FS155.51	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
S519.011	Elbury Holdings	IB-P9	Support in part	The Department of Conservation who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and set up pest control programmes in DOC areas, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist".		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Kiwi protection than making landowners carry out pest control.			
FS155.52	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Reject
S511.064	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P9	Support in part	Question the practicality and enforceability of requiring landowners to manage pest species. This would be a particularly onerous requirement for owners of large blocks of native forest. Focus on non-regulatory methods may be more appropriate. This policy would have more success if it was restricted to subdivision and development consents rather than as a general provisions applicable to all landowners.	Amend to clarify that restrictions on pet ownership and pest/weed control will be considered as conditions of consent for subdivision and development		Accept
FS93.47	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked. - These bans/restrictions are so widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who already keep their dogs under control. These owners pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife. - The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions. - To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate. - Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act. - Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly. - The methods which research shows us best reduces wandering dogs are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs.	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time. - These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans clearly don't work! - FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander. - In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective (Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable. Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (<i>Sus scrofa</i>), deer (<i>Cervus spp.</i>) and goats (<i>Capra hircus</i>) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular." - There has been no consultation with iwi or hapu in relation to dog bans and restrictions via sub-division consents. - Māori households are significantly more likely than other ethnicities to share their home or property with a dog (46%) and this continues to rise. The policy of banning and restricting dog owners from being able to live with their whānau members in Northland thus disproportionately affects the Māori community. This should be reviewed for potential - even if inadvertent - systemic racism. - Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions. - Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland now allow dogs. Yet Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC's scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis.			
FS88.55	Stephanie Lane		Oppose		Disallow		Reject
FS28.017	Dr John L Craig		Oppose	Conditions requiring control of pets are more suitable but unenforceable with cats.	Disallow in part	Amend IB-P9 to include the following: 'Require landowners to manage pets and pest species, including dogs, cats, possums, rats, and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas' (inferred).	Reject
FS23.255	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	Agree for the reasons set out in the submission that the provision should not apply to all landowners.	Allow	Make changes to give effect to the relief sought.	Accept
FS164.064	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	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.		beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	
FS548.156	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support in part	The policy as notified would be a particularly onerous requirement for owners of large blocks of native forest. Federated Farmers believes that Policy IB-P9 expands on IB-P7 in a way that contradicts the earlier policy. It places the burden of pest management solely on the landowner whereas IB-P7 endorses a collaborative approach from landowners and council.	Allow in part	Grant the relief sought but include wording to promote a combined approach from landowners and council consistent with IB-P7.	Accept in part
FS570.1635	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
FS566.1649	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
FS569.1671	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
S357.039	Sean Frieling	IB-P9	Support in part	It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DoC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. If the word require remains, then Council will either have to enforce this with DoC or help facilitate community groups to easily set up trapping programmes on DoC land.	Delete the word 'require' from this rule and insert the word 'assist' OR if the word 'require' is retained, enforce this with DOC or help facilitate community groups (or perhaps a District wide organisation) to easily set up trapping programmes on DOC land.		Reject
FS88.29	Stephanie Lane		Support	Agree DOC must take better care of their land. I have Queen's Chain along one side of my property and it is the source of all the gorse, tobacco weed, taiwanese cherry,	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				wild ginger, and likely mice and rats. I cannot barely keep up with control on my property due to DOC/Council land continuously re-instating pest species onto my property.			
FS88.30	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
S159.053	Horticulture New Zealand	IB-P9	Support in part	Need to be specific that landowners are only responsible for pets and pests on their land	Amend Policy IB-P9 as follows: Require landowners to manage pets and pest species on their land , including dogs, cats, possums, rats and mustelids, to avoid risks to threatened indigenous species, including avoiding the introduction of pets and pest species into kiwi present or high-density kiwi areas.		Accept in part
FS151.218	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.215	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
FS566.229	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
FS569.251	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S464.010	LJ King Ltd	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a	Delete the word "require" from this rule and replace it with "assist".		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.			
FS196.178	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS566.1555	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
S69.003	Robyn Josephine Baker	IB-P9	Support in part	We don't know of any of our neighbouring landowners who are not already actively and at their own expense, eradicating noxious animals/predators. To make it a legal requirement is unnecessary, and, in practical terms, unenforceable.	Amend IB-P9 to remove the word 'require' from the policy and replace it with 'assist'.		Reject
FS28.016	Dr John L Craig		Support	The wording should be encourage and assist not require.	Allow	Amend IB-P9 to replace 'require' with 'assist'.	Reject
S354.021	The BOI Watchdogs	IB-P9	Oppose	Dogs should not be considered a pest.	Delete reference to dogs in this policy		Accept in part
FS570.1030	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
FS566.1044	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
FS569.1066	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
S529.136	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-P9	Support		Retain IB-P9		Accept in part
FS570.2024	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2038	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2060	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.083	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P9	Support in part	Question the practicality and enforceability of requiring landowners to manage pest species. This would be a particularly onerous requirement for owners of large blocks of native forest. Focus on non-regulatory methods may be more appropriate. This policy would have more success if it was restricted to subdivision and development consents rather than as a general provisions applicable to all landowners.	Amend to clarify that restrictions on pet ownership and pest/weed control will be considered as conditions of consent for subdivision and development.		Accept
FS346.694	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
S442.181	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P9	Support in part	Support a requirement to manage domestic pets. Need to also include livestock (pigs, goats, cattle, etc.) as they can be very destructive to habitat for threatened species. The requirements should also extend to land occupiers. Further limits and conditions on pet ownership and a requirement for pest and weed control could be imposed in the context of a consent for subdivision or development.	- Amend to require management and (where appropriate) limits on the numbers of domestic pets and livestock for landowners and land occupiers; and - Amend to clarify that further limits and pest and weed control will be considered when possible and appropriate.		Reject
FS346.792	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
S568.003	Scrumptious Fruit Trust	IB-P9	Support in part		amend IB-P9 to refer to endangered foreshore habitat not just kiwi		Reject
FS348.230	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S569.010	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control.	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist".		Reject
FS348.241	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
S527.012	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-P9	Support	not stated	Retain IB-P9 as drafted (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1874	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S543.010	LJ King Limited	IB-P9	Support in part	DOC, who own the majority of Kiwi areas in the Far North, should be the first "landowner" to be "required" to do this under this rule. It is unreasonable to put this responsibility on all ratepayers in these zones, especially those adjacent to DOC lands which are usually (unless managed by community groups) a significant source of these pests. Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners	Delete the word "require" from this [policy] and replace it with "assist".		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				(except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control			
FS566.2171	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
S333.019	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-P10	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ~~...h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas;i.~~ ~~the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects;~~		Accept in part
S168.027	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-P10	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners;	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ...		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	~~h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas:~~ ~~i. the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;~~ ~~ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects; ...~~	
S187.020	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-P10	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ...~~h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas:~~ ~~i. the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;~~ ~~ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects~~	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S222.027	Wendover Two Limited	IB-P10	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ...<del>h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas;</del><del>i. the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;</del>~~ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects;~~...."	Accept in part
S254.005	Heather Golley	IB-P10	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna, significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.			
FS88.15	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
FS88.34	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Reject
S559.024	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-P10	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-P10 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS151.332	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.270	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2214	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.051	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2228	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
FS569.2250	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
S276.017	Russell Landcare Trust	IB-P10	Oppose	Policy IB-P10 is a list of matters to be considered when assessing proposals but it doesn't provide real guidance to decision-makers regarding the "bottom lines" for each of those matters.	Amend policy IB-P10 to provide real guidance to decision-makers regarding "bottom lines" for each of the matters.		Reject
FS23.091	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.	Accept
FS332.185	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS570.812	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
FS566.826	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
FS569.848	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
S511.065	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-P10	Support in part	Support the broad identification of matters that may be considered but the provision should also include development.	Amend "Manage development , land use and subdivision..."		Accept in part
FS164.065	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
FS570.1636	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
FS566.1650	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1672	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
S454.086	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	IB-P10	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 the chapeau of IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision, subject to Policy I-Px , to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application:		Reject
FS346.032	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS404.021	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	As the D-G opposes the submitter's relief for I-P2, the consequential amendments are also opposed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.361	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the amendment to give effect to the	Allow	Amend	Reject
S243.029	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-P10	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ~~...h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas;i. the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use~~		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	~~biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects;~~"		
FS570.587	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
FS566.601	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
FS569.623	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
S354.022	The BOI Watchdogs	IB-P10	Oppose	Controls should not be placed on the ownership of dogs until BOI Watchdog concerns have been addressed in order to determine if they are appropriate. Refer to full submission.	Delete this policy and all its subsections		Reject
FS570.1031	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
FS566.1045	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
FS569.1067	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.137	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-P10	Support in part	The draft PDP of 2021 contained a policy (IB-P10) that specifically aimed to 'Protect indigenous biodiversity by considering the following matters when assessing proposals for land use and subdivision: a.the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b.cumulative effects of activities that may result in loss or degradation of habitats...' It is a matter of concern that the PDP	Amend wording of policy IB-P10 to Protect (inferred) ~~Manage~~ Protect land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				contains a weaker policy and the word 'protect' was removed.	where relevant to the application:.....		
FS570.2025	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2039	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2061	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S442.084	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-P10	Support in part	Support the broad identification of matters that may be considered but the provision should also include development.	Amend "Manage development , land use and subdivision..."		Accept in part
FS346.695	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
S167.020	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-P10	Support in part	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Amend Policy IB-P10 as follows: Manage land use and subdivision to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent for indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance, including (but not limited to) consideration of the following matters where relevant to the application: ... ~~h. where the area has been mapped or assessed as a Significant Natural Areas:~~ ~~i. the extent to which the proposal will adversely affect the ecological significance, values and function of that area;~~ ~~ii. whether it is appropriate or practicable to use biodiversity offsets or environmental biodiversity compensation to address more than minor residual adverse effects;~~"		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.382	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S163.014	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	Rules	Support in part	Given that a lot of people carry out pest control of their own volition, and setting up pest control programmes in DOC areas is a very difficult and convoluted process, there are better ways to achieve the outcome of Kiwi protection than "making" landowners (except DOC, lets face it) carry out pest control. Landowners are often the victims of irresponsible pet owners who dump unwanted pets	Insert methods to increase activity around pet management and desexing		Reject
S396.024	Matauri X Incorporation	Rules	Oppose	Matauri X do not believe that the provisions of the aforementioned Chapter appropriately meet section 6(e) of the RMA 1991. The approach also does not promote kaitiakitanga and the entire chapter is rejected.	delete rules		Accept in part
S425.025	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Oppose	Council have not mapped 'significant natural areas' (SNA) but have included reference to SNA in rules. PHTTCCT consider the absence of mapping SNA will result in implementation confusion and unnecessary cost to PHTTCCT in order to determine compliance.	amend IB to: - Remove reference to significant natural areas in rules and rely on indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds.		Accept in part
S425.028	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Furthermore, the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	amend provisions to ensure that maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.		Accept
S440.004	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	Rules	Oppose	There must be no costs associated with FNDC consents, consultations, inspections and other administrative impositions upon the property owner.	not stated		Reject
S440.005	Ronald Toni Wooldridge	Rules	Oppose	It is appropriate to provide landowners with a list of associated FNDC empowerment and potential actions, consequences as a result of the SNA designation.	Insert provisions explaining potential actions and consequences of a SNA designation		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S261.007	Amber Hookway	Rules	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Remove SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.15	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.33	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.15	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.15	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.28	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
S264.007	Wilson Hookway	Rules	Support	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hiko to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development; implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Remove SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.16	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.34	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.16	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.16	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.29	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
S287.008	Tristan Simpkin	Rules	Oppose	Oppose SNA Maps and requirement of Ecologist report. FNDC had originally withdrawn the SNA maps. With this new rule they are being snuck back in, and then also forcing anyone with bush on their property to get an ecologist report (\$\$\$) to prove that its not an SNA. So that tells us that all bush is regarded as an SNA 'unless proved otherwise' - which is a costly activity. This is not incentivising people to plant trees and create wetlands, because of the control over that area once it's matured. Far North residents will be better off to not plant anything. This therefore is a loss of property and property rights.	Amend to allow us to be stewards of our own land and trees and bush we've planted. Remove the requirement for the ecologist report, it's another red tape item which adds to the cost of building and developing, driving the cost of living upwards.		Accept
FS29.15	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree fully with removing the Ecologist report requirement. Just adding red tape to the cost of building, when a few rushes in a paddock are classed as a wetland.	Allow		Accept
FS570.879	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
FS566.893	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
FS569.915	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
S483.147	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Top Energy acknowledges that objectives and policies for infrastructure within SNAs are located within the Infrastructure Chapter but seek to ensure that appropriate provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of electricity infrastructure (in particular) is made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter in alignment with method 4.6.3, Policies 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 given that it also relates to indigenous	Amend rules to allow the suitable provision of new infrastructure where there is an operational and functional need, and the ongoing operation, maintenance, repair and upgrading of infrastructure within areas of indigenous biodiversity.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				vegetation clearance not captured as significant			
FS196.214	Joe Carr		Support	remember indigenous vegetation covers close to 50% of the District	Allow		Accept in part
FS111.077	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provision for operation, repair, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure should be made in the objectives and policies of this Chapter.	Allow in part	allow in part the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.074	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.198	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
S483.149	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Oppose	The rules as currently proposed, reference activities 'within' and 'outside of a Significant Natural Area (SNA). However, SNA's have not been included as a mapped value in the PDP. Accordingly, for a Plan user to understand whether or not the provisions relate to indigenous biodiversity, it is assumed they will be required to obtain an ecological assessment (as is indicated in IB-R4) given that the mapping undertaken by Council is no longer publicly available, and as it has not been included in the Plan will not be subject to a Schedule 1 process and cannot be relied on by Council as a statutory layer. This is not considered to be a fair or reasonable approach, and does not provide any certainty for Plan users. This is of particular concern given that these rules have been identified as having immediate 'legal effect'. Further, while it is not necessarily of concern to Top Energy, it is noted that this approach, as well as generating issues for	Amend rules to remove reference to 'Significant Natural Areas' in the absence of these being mapped as part of the PDP, and enable appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of infrastructure.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Plan users, will create monitoring and compliance issues for Council. With the above in mind, Top Energy seeks that the reference to SNAs be removed from the rules, and that the clearance of indigenous vegetation is what is managed through these rules. Further, that adequate provision is made for upgrades to existing legally established infrastructure to enable future proofing of the infrastructure so as to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of the community as is directed by RPS Policy 5.2.2.			
FS111.078	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT support enabling appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance for the operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of infrastructure.	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part
FS346.076	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.200	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
S364.010	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	Rules	Not Stated	With the advent of myrtle rust, all Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa are currently considered threatened. The taxonomy and current threatened status of manuka and kanuka should be reflected and managed appropriately through objectives, policies and rules in the proposed plan. The relief sought is to be confirmed during the subsequent District Plan review stages once the 2022 version of the "Conservation status of New Zealand indigenous vascular plants" is available.	Amend objectives, policies and rules as appropriate to recognise and implement measures to address and manage the increased threat status of myrtle rust for manuka and kanuka		Reject
FS548.085	Northland Federated		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			consultation occurring. As well, manuka and kanuka cause significant tissues for farmers in that they can grow like a pest species and be very invasive in places.			
FS548.095	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The reduction in the clearance is onerous and will place unnecessary restrictions on the legitimate need for clearing indigenous vegetation. It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring. As well, manuka and kanuka cause significant tissues for farmers in that they can grow like a pest species and be very invasive in places.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1091	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
FS346.150	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
FS566.1105	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
FS569.1127	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
S511.066	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Rules	Support in part	The chapter rules say the rules simply apply to all zones. However, there is a mismatch between the proposed plan and the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater. Under the NES-FW 2020, reg 54 vegetation clearance is a non-complying activity. The rules are not permitted to be more lenient than the NES-FW.	Amend so as not to conflict or be more lenient than the NES-FW		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS164.066	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
FS548.157	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The submitter seems to be suggesting that the standards make all vegetation clearance a non-complying activity. Section 54 of the National Environmental Standards - Fresh Water only refers to vegetation clearance as a non-complying activity within, or within a 10 m setback from, a natural inland wetland.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept
FS570.1637	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
FS566.1651	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
FS569.1673	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
S451.010	Pacific Eco-Logic	Rules	Support in part	Wetland drainage is not addressed	Insert rules and/or clarify what Northland Regional Council consents are/will be required for wetland drainage under the new Northland Regional Plan		Reject
FS332.197	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	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS570.1515	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
FS566.1529	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
FS569.1551	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
S442.005	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	A large number of indigenous species are currently classed as threatened or at risk under the national NZ Threat Classification System. About 50 indigenous bird species have become extinct in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result of human activities. Many technical and policy reports have noted that concerted action is required to prevent further deterioration.	Amend to adopt rules to control and place consent conditions on subdivision, land use or development in, or adjacent to, locations where indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under the NZTCS) are present.		Reject
FS404.066	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1701	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.616	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
FS569.1728	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S442.006	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	The Regional Policy Statement (Method 4.4.3(2)(b)) requires the DP to implement 'Controls on the introduction or keeping of species with recognised pest potential' as part of its implementation of RPS Policy 4.4.1 (examples in Box 1 above).	Amend rules for banning potential predator pets (dogs, cats, mustelids, etc) from areas where kiwi or other at risk/threatened species are present and vulnerable to these predators (e.g. shore birds such as dotterel, wetland birds such as bittern and dabchick, at-risk lizards, and other animals).		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				We consider that the DP should include Policy similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to this type of predation.			
FS404.067	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS570.1702	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS346.617	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
FS569.1729	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept
S442.008	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	We consider that the DP should include Policy similar to Policy 12.2.4.10 of the Operative DP but with the aim of protecting not just kiwi, dotterel and brown teal, but also other indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk (under NZTCS) and vulnerable to this type of predation.	Amend PDP to provide for] appropriate fencing for vulnerable species in the area, for example, fencing that allows free movement of kiwi; or in other cases fencing to stop dogs entering a kiwi area.		Reject
FS404.069	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1704	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS346.619	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS569.1731	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
S529.117	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Oppose	The PDP provisions do not provide the level of protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision	Amend the PDP rules to provide the level of protection noted in the RMA, Te Mana o te Taiao, anticipated NPS for indigenous biodiversity, Regional Policy Statement, Environment Court decision		Accept in part
FS570.2005	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2019	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2041	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.121	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part		Amend the PDP rules, to implement the objectives to 'protect, maintain and increase indigenous biodiversity for future generations', or protect significant vegetation and fauna 'for future generations'		Accept in part
FS570.2009	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2023	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2045	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.129	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	PDP rules should actively protect areas where kiwi or indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under NZ Threat Classification System) are present. For example, landowners should be required to contact DOC for a trained detection dog or other investigation, and agree with DOC a clear plan to protect vulnerable species, before any vegetation clearance starts. Where appropriate, clearance should be staggered over time, so that indigenous species are able to move to shelter	Insert PDP rule around protection of kiwi or indigenous species		Reject
FS570.2017	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
FS566.2031	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2053	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S529.133	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Support in part	A large number of indigenous species are currently classed as threatened or at risk under the national NZ Threat Classification System.⁴ About 50 indigenous bird species have become extinct in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result of human activities.⁵ Many technical and policy reports have noted that concerted action is required to prevent further deterioration.⁶ As noted above, RMA s31(1) applies to decision-making in relation to the use and development of land - District Council functions include 'the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of ... (iii) the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity'. The Regional Policy Statement for Northland and Regional Plan contain a number of provisions that refer to aspects of biodiversity that are not about mapped SNAs (Box 1, below, provides examples). As noted above, under s75 of the RMA, the DP is required to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement, and must avoid inconsistency with the Regional Plan. The DP can be more stringent than the RPS, but cannot be more relaxed	Amend the rules to address RPS s4.4 regarding 'Maintaining and enhancing indigenous ecosystems and species' and 'indigenous taxa that are listed as threatened or at risk'.		Accept in part
FS570.2021	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2035	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2057	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.234	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Rules	Not Stated	District councils manage the margins of water bodies and the activities that can occur in these areas. Several parts of the	Amend the PDP to give full effect to the NPS - Freshwater Management 2020		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) give national direction to district councils specifically. The NPS-FM contains objectives and policies to ensure that natural and physical resources are managed in a way that prioritises the health and well-being of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems, the health needs of people (such as drinking water) and the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being, now and in the future. The implementation of the NPS-FM and managing freshwater to give effect to Te Mana o Te Wai is primarily the responsibility of the regional council, however clause 3.5(4) specifically requires that every territorial authority includes objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments. Every territorial authority must include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments. Recent government guidance on the NPS-FM14 (p.8) notes that district plans must be reviewed/amended to give effect to the NPS-FM, including the following aspects: 'District plans must be reviewed and, if necessary, amended to give effect to the NPS-FM "as soon as reasonably practicable". 'The NPS-FM applies to all freshwater, and Te Mana o te Wai is relevant to all resource management where it affects freshwater, including in city and district planning.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				'Clause 3.5 Integrated management requires a ki uta ki tai (integrated approach) to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai. It also sets out requirements relevant to city and district councils. This includes encouraging the coordination and sequencing of urban growth, and promoting positive effects and managing adverse effects of urban development on freshwater bodies. 'To give effect to Te Mana o te Wai, councils must consider matters such as how urban growth and increases in impervious surfaces will impact on stormwater flows, how stormwater affects the water bodies it is discharged to, and methods to manage urban growth and stormwater discharge. The identification and control of urban growth areas must prioritise the health and well-being of water bodies.'			
FS570.2121	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2135	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2157	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S148.019	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Not explicitly stated	Amend rules to provide for the clearance and incidental damage of indigenous vegetation, including indigenous vegetation that may meet the criteria for an SNA but excluding any scheduled SNA , within a plantation forest as a permitted activity in accordance with regulation 93 and 94 of the NES-PF.		Accept
FS346.525	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.131	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
S442.085	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	The chapter rules say the rules simply apply to all zones. However, there is a mismatch between the proposed plan and the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater. Under the NES-FW 2020, reg 54 vegetation clearance is a non-complying activity. The rules are not permitted to be more lenient than the NES-FW.	Amend so as not to conflict or be more lenient than the NES-FW.		Reject
FS346.696	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
S442.154	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Support in part	Wetland drainage is not addressed.	Insert rules and/or clarify what Northland Regional Council consents are/will be required for wetland drainage under the new Northland Regional Plan.		Reject
FS346.765	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
S527.013	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Oppose	The PDP lacks rules to implement policies in this chapter.	Amend to strengthen rules to give effect to policies in this chapter (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1875	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S527.019	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Oppose	PDP subdivision policy SUB-P4 refers to 'manage' subdivision as detailed in the district-wide natural environment values, but there are very few rules that put any effective environmental protection policies into effect. Those do not take account of the	Amend rules to give effect to the protection policies (inferred)		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				need to, at least, maintain indigenous biodiversity or ecosystems.			
FS566.1881	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.130	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Notes	Not Stated	PDP rules should actively protect areas where kiwi or indigenous species classed as threatened or at risk (under NZ Threat Classification System) are present. For example, landowners should be required to contact DOC for a trained detection dog or other investigation, and agree with DOC a clear plan to protect vulnerable species, before any vegetation clearance starts. Where appropriate, clearance should be staggered over time, so that indigenous species are able to move to shelter	Insert an appendix to the PDP to include, or refer to, a protocol that sets out guiding principles and procedures for protection of kiwi or indigenous species		Reject
FS93.35	Leonie M Exel		Support in part	I support kiwi protection. I support any rational, evidence-driven solution to limiting the number of kiwi run over by cars, the main killer in Northland. I do not support any 'solution' which may involve banning or restricting the number of dogs and cats on a property, via the sub-division consent process. These are means which have not worked over the last two decades. Sane solutions include ensuring that dog owners living in kiwi areas register, micro-chip, de-sex their dogs, keep them in at night, and have fenced properties.	Allow		Reject
FS570.2018	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2032	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2054	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S483.148	Top Energy Limited	Notes	Support	Top Energy supports the clear direction provided in the notes of this Chapter regarding how the chapter interacts with others	Retain Notes		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.075	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought do not adequately recognise and provide for s6(c) matters.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.199	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
S279.004	Manu Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R1	Oppose	This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. It is a perverse to penalise such a landowner if they wish to then carry out a land use activity which requires vegetation clearance or land disturbance while at the same time still retaining or protecting the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site.	Amend to allow for an increase in the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place, such as provided for in the SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision rule. This would reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.		Reject
S355.021	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-R1	Support in part	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R1 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.		Accept in part
S168.028	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-R1	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not	Amend Rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities within and outside a Significant		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. The use of building platform (ie single residential unit) should not matter in assessing its effects relative to Indigenous vegetation. The provision for the use should be conferred from the underlying zoning. A more effective and efficient way to achieve the objective is to simply refer to 'building platforms'. Furthermore, the rule confuses density rules applying to residential units which are specified elsewhere in the Plan. It is appropriate to add further exclusions for 'existing domestic gardens' in recognition that many existing gardens include indigenous vegetation. In addition, ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be excluded in recognition that Indigenous vegetation may need to be modified for such purposes, including for access tracks for planting and pest control and to release new plants.	Natural Area ... 7. To allow for the construction of a ~~single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m²; 14. For existing domestic gardens 15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works	
S187.021	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-R1	Support in part	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision requested relating, but not limited to, the following: reasons provided in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity overview section; the use of building platform (i.e. single residential unit) should	Amend rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities ~~within and outside a~~ Significant Natural Area	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not matter in assessing its effects relative to indigenous vegetation); the rule confuses density rules applying to residential units; and appropriate exclusions to the Rule.	7. To allow for the construction of a ~~single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m ² 14. For existing domestic gardens15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works	
S222.028	Wendover Two Limited	IB-R1	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, the use of building platform (ie single residential unit) should not matter in assessing its effects relative to Indigenous vegetation. The provision for the use should be conferred from the underlying zoning. A more effective and efficient way to achieve the objective is to simply refer to 'building platforms'.	Amend rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities ~~within and outside a Significant Natural Area...~~ 7. To allow for the construction of a ~~single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m ; 14. For existing domestic gardens 15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Furthermore, the rule confuses density rules applying to residential units which are specified elsewhere in the Plan. It is appropriate to add further exclusions for 'existing domestic gardens' in recognition that many existing gardens include indigenous vegetation. In addition, ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be excluded in recognition that Indigenous vegetation may need to be modified for such purposes, including for access tracks for planting and pest control and to release new plants.		
S473.001	Adams-Te Whata Whanau Trust	IB-R1	Support in part	it is unclear whether clearing the bush to manage fire risk or plants damaging buildings would be covered by PER-1 13 for the operation, repair and maintenance of building activities or PER-1 -11 creation and maintenance of fire breaks to manage fire risk.	amend IB-R1 PER-1 1. "To address an immediate risk to the health and safety of the public or probable, imminent or actual damage to property" PER-1 13. "It is for the protection, operation, repair and maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established."	Reject
S416.033	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	IB-R1	Support	KiwiRail supports the provision of the rule which acknowledges the need to operate, repair and maintain infrastructure where it has been lawfully established as a permitted activity.	Retain Rule IB-R1, in particular point 13	Accept in part
S331.044	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	IB-R1	Support	The submitter supports rule IB-R1 Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities within and outside a Significant Natural Area, as it provides for the pruning, trimming and clearance of indigenous vegetation where it is for the operation, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings, which can include educational facilities.	Retain rule IB-R1 Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities within and outside a Significant Natural Area, as proposed.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S463.031	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-R1	Support	WBF supports the inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the various activities listed. It recommends minor amendments to sub-clause (3) because: The distinction between use of tracks for walking or cycling appears to be of no consequence if the limit on clearance is observed. Increasing the allowance to a 1.8m wide path would be consistent with the minimum standard for pedestrian paths provided in reserves specified in s7.2.5.3 of Council's proposed Engineering Standards V. 0.5 (April 2022). The focus on manual methods appears to be redundant if the requirement to maintain larger trees is observed.	Amend point 3. of PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 as follows: 3. The formation of walking or cycling tracks no greater-less than 1.82m wide using manual methods which does not require the removal of any tree over 300 mm in girth.		Reject
S157.001	Tane's Tree Trust - Northland Totara Working Group	IB-R1	Support	It is critical that sustainable indigenous forestry activities are not subject to unnecessary additional, costly and uncertain resource management consenting processes required by the District Plan. In contrast, appropriate sustainable indigenous forest management activities under the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) approved 'Sustainable Forest Management Plans' (SFMPs) need to be encouraged, supported, and explicitly provided for.	Retain Point 12 of Rule IB-R1 PER-1 (inferred)		Accept
FS112.4	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission and agree that sustainable indigenous forestry activities should be encouraged, supported, and explicitly provided for.	Allow		Accept
FS28.022	Dr John L Craig		Support	Sustainable native forestry or any other form of Managed Indigenous Forestry should be encouraged and supported. Such areas should not be considered as SNAs.	Allow	Retain IB-R1 point 12 (nferred).	Accept
FS404.005	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The D-G is concerned that permitted activity or other rules of this nature would rely on the assessment of effects on indigenous biodiversity that has been undertaken under a plan or permit under	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the Forests Act 1949. The plans or permits are approved or issued by the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI). When MPI consider these plans and permits, the consideration over what is 'sustainable' under the Forests Act 1949, is different to 'sustainable management' under the Resource Management Act. This means that when MPI are considering any permit or plan, the framework for decision making is different to what should be considered under the RMA. It is inappropriate to incorporate this different assessment framework in the district plan.			
S255.003	Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R1	Support in part	There is no provision in this rule to credit landowners who are protecting indigenous vegetation or significant natural areas on their site while at the same time wishing to carry out a landuse activity which requires the removal of same, elsewhere.	Insert a new rule equivalent to SUB-R6 (Environmental Benefit Subdivision) but for landuse which Rewards landowners who have already protected areas, and incentivises landowners to protect areas.		Reject
FS112.8	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. Where landowners are protecting, enhancing, or restoring indigenous vegetation, there should be allowances for land use activity on areas of indigenous vegetation no matter the age of the indigenous vegetation if the outcomes are an overall gain in biodiversity.	Allow		Reject
FS24.40	Lynley Newport		Support	I believe this concept has considerable merit.	Allow		Reject
FS58.5	Harold Corbett		Support	Very important that past actions for biodiversity gains are recognised and landowners are incentivised to net biodiversity gains.	Allow		Reject
FS172.274	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS28.018	Dr John L Craig		Support	Landowners who protect, enhance, and restore native biodiversity should be allowed to clear parts of their past plantings regardless of age if the outcome is minor relative to the gains produced by their past	Allow	Insert new rule equivalent to SUB-R6 for land use which rewards landowners who have existing protected areas and incentivise landowners to protect areas.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				actions. Rules need to be encouraging not just punitive.			
S364.044	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-R1	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?	Insert clarification within Rule IB-R1 for the inclusion of vegetation clearance for biosecurity reasons. Insert a definition for "biosecurity reasons", if appropriate.		Accept in part
FS109.11	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Support	It is important to allow provisions for the clearance of weeds and pests	Allow		Accept in part
FS354.114	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	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 Pest Management Plan and unwanted organisms under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Allow	Allow S364.044 to the extent that biosecurity reasons' is based in the HortNZ submission on IB-P7.	Accept in part
FS570.1125	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
FS346.184	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
FS566.1139	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
FS569.1161	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
S518.002	New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated	IB-R1	Support	It is important that Kiwifruit Vine Health can identify and remove wild kiwifruit without delay for biosecurity reasons and to protect indigenous biodiversity.	Retain IB-R1 as notified.		Accept in part
FS151.33	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S559.014	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-R1	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-R1 and redraft in conjunction with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part
FS151.147	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS196.30	Joe Carr		Support	A reasonable request from Ngati Rehia, that is made all the more necessary because the definition of SNA is extremely inclusive (read DoC submissions re myrtle rust etc) and surely beyond that contemplated by Parliament when the RMA was promulgated?	Allow		Accept in part
FS23.260	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2204	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
FS348.041	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2218	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
FS569.2240	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
S159.054	Horticulture New Zealand	IB-R1	Support	Clearance for biosecurity purposes is supported.	Retain subsection 4 of Rule IB-R1		Accept in part
FS151.219	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.216	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
FS566.230	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
FS569.252	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
S333.020	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-R1	Support in part	As above in the reasons for the changes to the Overview section. In addition, the use of building platform (ie single residential unit) should not matter in assessing its effects relative to Indigenous vegetation. The provision for the use should be conferred from the underlying zoning. A more effective and efficient way to achieve the objective is to simply refer to 'building platforms'. Furthermore, the rule confuses density rules applying	Amend rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities within and ~~outside a~~ Significant Natural Area ~~7. To allow for the construction of a single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m ; 14. For existing domestic gardens15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to residential units which are specified elsewhere in the Plan. It is appropriate to add further exclusions for 'existing domestic gardens' in recognition that many existing gardens include indigenous vegetation. In addition, ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be excluded in recognition that Indigenous vegetation may need to be modified for such purposes, including for access tracks for planting and pest control and to release new plants.			
FS196.29	Joe Carr		Support	it is unreasonable for Council to extend it's control of such an activity beyond SNA's, as to do so would have the unintended consequence of discouraging landowners from planting indigenous vegetation.	Allow		Reject
S195.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	IB-R1	Support in part	I support providing for limited clearance of indigenous vegetation in the circumstances listed in IB-R1. This is a practical approach to recognising that there will be circumstance where limited pruning, trimming and clearance is necessary and practical. I particularly support the inclusion of items 6 & 7, although believe the threshold applied to item 7 is too restrictive to accommodate a residential unit, onsite services and access. That access may in some instances be quite long and 1,000m ² clearance would be insufficient. Item 7 recognises those instances where there is existing title upon which the owner is entitled to anticipate being able to build/live on. They may not be able to do so without some level of clearance to provide for the house site and access	Retain Rule IB-R1 as written, with the exception that item 7 be amended to read "and it does not exceed a 2,000m ²		Reject
FS196.31	Joe Carr		Support	this would support the expectation that a property has that the use of their land is not	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sterilized, noting that about 45% of the Far North District is of predominantly indigenous cover. How much more does Council want?			
FS332.218	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Threshold of 1000m2 is necessary to protect the environment, especially in coastal areas.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept
S542.012	Marianna Fenn	IB-R1	Oppose	(2) - Dead trees in SNAs should only be felled if they pose a significant safety risk as standing dead trees provide important roost sites for threatened native species such as bats. Where dead trees are felled they must be left to decompose in situ to enable nutrient cycling and provide important habitat (7) - Clearance of vegetation for the purposes of developing a residential unit within an SNA should be a controlled activity to ensure adequate consideration has been given to avoiding and/or mitigating adverse effects (9) - The width of permitted clearance for fence lines is excessive. While it may be necessary to drive posts using a tractor you do not need tractor clearance down either side of the fenceline (10) - Recognise the need for landowners to be able to keep their land in a "cleared" state without needing resource consent but the time frame should be reduced to 5 year old vegetation and there has to be an available evidential basis to establish the age e.g. google earth, photos or other records. (12) - The Forests Act does not have the same purpose or principles as the RMA so the council cannot rely on decisions made under this Act	Delete (2) and (12). Delete (7) and add a new controlled activity rule for new residential units in SNAs Amend (9) ... not exceed 4 m in total width Amend (10) to reduce it to vegetation where it is possible to establish that it is under 5 years old without expert input.		Reject
FS196.32	Joe Carr		Oppose	Submitter intentions are unreasonable and impractical. there are may public and private roads through what NRC has deemed is SNA. It would be dangerous if maintenance of trees and removal of dead trees was prevented,	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.33	Joe Carr		Oppose	Is impractical. Would prevent the maintenance of may public and private roads and walking tracks.	Disallow		Accept
FS393.032	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Oppose	The PDP thresholds are considered to adequately sustain the presence of SNA without degradation of this resource	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS401.040	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Oppose	The PDP thresholds are considered to adequately sustain the presence of SNA without degradation of this resource	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.2140	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
FS346.875	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2154	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
FS569.2176	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
S364.045	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-R1	Oppose	Excessive clearance of indigenous vegetation can create further fragmentation and isolation of indigenous ecosystems communities. Under point 9 of Rule IB-R1, a 7m wide strip of indigenous vegetation could be removed to allow for the construction of a new fence. The Director-General queries whether this width is necessary for the function of the fencing activity. It is considered that a reduced width (e.g., 2.0m in width either side of the fence line) would be just as appropriate and result in less vegetation loss.	Amend point 9 of Rule IB-R1 as follows: The construction of a new fence where the purpose of the new fence is to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation provided that the clearance does not exceed ~~3.5m~~ 2.0m in width either side of the fence line;		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.34	Joe Carr		Oppose	as the effect of the submitter would prevent maintaining fence lines with for instance a tractor and rotary slasher, is the submitter going to organise a team of reliable volunteers to do the job by hand. I doubt if the submitter has any idea of the extent of the issue.	Disallow		Accept
FS548.094	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The reduction in the clearance is onerous and will place unnecessary restrictions on the legitimate need for clearing indigenous vegetation. It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring. As well, manuka and kanuka cause significant tissues for farmers in that they can grow like a pest species and be very invasive in places.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS548.096	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Landowners need the ability to be able to utilize their land effectively and efficiently. Part of this includes the removal of vegetation to allow pasture to be formed and crops to be grown.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1126	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
FS346.185	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
FS566.1140	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
FS569.1162	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
S512.026	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	IB-R1	Support	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 this approach provides for these activities and so support the references to addressing immediate risks to health and safety, and managing fire risk. This aligns with the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017.	retain IB-R1		Accept in part
FS196.35	Joe Carr		Support	Submitter is so practical and sensible.	Allow		Accept in part
S479.016	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-R1	Oppose	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R1 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.		Accept in part
FS196.36	Joe Carr		Support	The way the FNDC is proceeding on this matter of it's citizens being able to exercise the right to reasonably use their land WRT the almost ubiquitous presence of indigenous vegetation is OTT. Policies and rules should focus on the protection from unreasonable clearance of Ngahere (climax indigenous vegetation). Unreasonable/excessive regulations adversely affect the much needed	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				cooperation of the mainstream community with Council to achieve a myriad of objectives. Remember the SNA march on Council.		
S511.067	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-R1	Oppose	Para(2) - Dead trees should not be removed from SNAs but may be felled for safety reasons. Leaving them to rot down in situ is critical for nutrient cycling and providing habitat for native species. Sub-policies 3 and 12 does not protect or maintain indigenous biodiversity when it is found in a permitted activity. Allowing for vegetation clearance that is covered in the listed documents abrogates Council's authority. Sub-policy 4 is to lose and needs to refer directly to the Northland Regional Pest Plan or directions under the Biosecurity Act Sub-policy 6 - clearance within 20 meters is to far and an enormous amount significant vegetation could be cleared with 20, this should be a maximum of 10 meters or limit it to the curtilage Sub-Poly 7 - clearance of vegetation for the purposes of developing a residential unit within an SNA should be a controlled activity to enable the council to have input about what areas are to be cleared and potential mitigation / offsetting etc., Sub-policy 8 - council unlawfully abrogates its duties under ss6(c) and 31 in relation to protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity. All of the other instruments listed have there own purposes which may not necessarily reflect the requirements of the RMA Sub-Policy 9 allows for an extremely wide clearance on either side of the fence of 3.5 m. That would accommodate an exceptionally large bulldozer or tractor. This should be reduced to 1 meter either side of the fence which in effect is 2 meters in total Sub-Policy 10 - Forest & Bird acknowledge that this is down from 20 year old in the previous draft, however we remain concerned. It may be difficult to determine the age of some plant species and may require expert	Amend IB-R1 2. To fell dead trees in SNAs that are a safety risk to life or property ~~remove...~~ felled trees should remain in situ in SNAs if it is possible, no more indigenous vegetation is cleared or trimmed than is necessary for safe felling and the clearance is undertaken in accordance with advice from a suitably qualified arborist; Delete sub-policies 3, and 12. Replace sub-policy 4 with ~~4. Clearance for biosecurity reasons.~~ Clearance is for the removal of material infected y unwanted organisms as declared by the Minister for Primary industries Chief Technical Officer, or an emergency declared under the Biosecurity Act 1993; or 4X.The clearance is unavoidable in the course of removing pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any regional pest management plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993 or where this occurs as part of indigenous biodiversity restoration or enhancement Amend sub-policy 6 as: 6. To create or maintain a 10 20 meter setback ... Delete Sub-policy 7 and add a new controlled activity rule for new	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				assessment in some cases. For example in a stunted wet area and for coastal vegetation. It is not appropriate to require expert assessor in a permitted rule and this makes the rule uncertain and difficult to enforce. F&B is also concerned that this rule will result in the loss of regenerating vegetation or enhancement plantings, for example where land changes hands or land use changes. Sub-Policy 11 - needs to be tied to a specific figure to make this certain or limit it to maintenance of existing firebreaks Sub-policy 13 is very broad and could include a range of clearances. The sub-policy is uncertain at the moment because it is left to the discretion of the person undertaking the activity to determine how much clearance should occur.	residential units in SNAs Make sub-policy 8 at least a controlled activity Amend 9. ... not exceed ~~3.5~~ 1 m in width either side of the fence line Delete sub-policy 10 consider relating this to kanuka and manuka that is less than 10 years old and is only significant because of the risk of myrtle rust or reduce it vegetation where it is possible to prove that it is no older than 5 years old. Amend sub-policy 11 11.Maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk Amend sub-policy13 as 13. It is for the operation, repair and maintenance of the following activities and is within 1 meter (either side) of the ...		
FS196.37	Joe Carr		Oppose	F&B have not offered to provide a pool of volunteers to clear the fencelines should the ultimate paragraph be imposed, the writer of this submission has never picked up a slasher. You need close to 3 metres to safely swing a slasher!	Disallow		Accept
FS23.256	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Disagree that trees felled within SNA should always be left in-situ, as this unreasonably constrains use being made of the felled trees for firewood or for other reuse or cultural purposes.	Disallow	Disallow the relief to the extent it requires all felled trees to be retained in situ.	Accept
FS164.067	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	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
				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.			
FS548.158	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers fully supports the permitted activity status for the removal of dead vegetation. Dead vegetation can present health and safety concerns as well as limit the ability for farmers to carry out day-to-day maintenance and farming operations. The proposed amendments to clearance limits and setbacks are opposed by Federated Farmers. The relief sought by the submitter has the potential to adversely affect the ability of farmers to continue with lawfully established operations including fencing, track maintenance and for health and safety reasons. The creation as well as the maintenance of firebreaks needs to remain a permitted activity.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept
FS354.115	Horticulture New Zealand		Support in part	Clarification of 'biosecurity purposes' in clause 4 as sought by the submitter is supported and consistent with the HortNZ submission on IB-P7.	Allow	Allow S511.067 in respect of IB-R1 (4).	Reject
FS570.1638	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
FS566.1652	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
FS569.1674	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
S130.001	Lynley Newport	IB-R1	Support in part	The submitter supports the provision in IB-R1 of permitted clearance of indigenous vegetation in the circumstances listed in the rule. The submitter particularly supports the inclusion of PER-1 #s 6 & 7, however, considers the threshold applied in #7 to be too restrictive to accommodate a residential unit, on-site services and access.	Amend IB-R1 #7 to read: 7. To allow for the construction of a single residential unit on a title and essential associated on-site infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 2,000m2		Reject
FS196.82	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS28.023	Dr John L Craig		Support in part	The submitter may wish to undertake built development to accommodate tourism development on land that they have rehabilitated in the future. If the land is identified as a SNA due the submitters own rehabilitation efforts the rule is too restrictive. Under the proposed FNDP if you plant native vegetation on your property then your future options become extremely restricted and a significant loss of property rights. The provisions of the FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within reforestation areas or require resource consent for activities. In addition, reforestation using native species could result in areas eventually meeting the criteria of SNAs incurring even further restrictions. A basic principle is preservation of a viable population rather than necessarily preservation of an individual. An activity within an area of managed indigenous vegetation, for example, clearing an area for future access or a dwelling, may be adverse for individual specimens of flora or fauna, but the populations on the property as a whole remain infinitely better off than prior to the planting or management of that vegetation, or continued pastoral farming. Provisions should encourage native flora and fauna whilst not placing restrictions on future land use.	Allow in part	Amend IB-R1 to provide for the construction of a single residential unit on a title and associated on-site infrastructure and access that does not exceed 2,000m2 and for some residential and other activities on land that was actively rehabilitated to become identified as a SNA (inferred).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.138	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	IB-R1	Support	Federated Farmers supports Rule IB-R1, and the associated performance stand PER-1 has it is currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Rule IB-R1 or wording with similar intent		Accept in part
FS25.134	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Supports in principle the need to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas and to give effect to the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity. However, the process needs to ensure landowners affected have a fair and reasonable opportunity to be involved in decisions affecting their land.	Allow in part	Allow original submission in part subject to appropriate wording and mapping.	Accept in part
FS325.079	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT support the inclusion of a Schedule to record Significant Natural Areas subject to ground truthing and ecological assessment to ensure accuracy and ensure the list SNA's contribute to achievement of the strategic direction.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.1370	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
FS346.372	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
FS566.1384	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
FS569.1406	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
S182.016	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	IB-R1	Support in part	Support the rule that permits the clearance of indigenous vegetation from land which was previously cleared for the purposes of maintaining improved pasture Seek to add Improved Pasture for clarity Oppose any timeframe limitations on the clearance of indigenous vegetation for the purposes of maintaining improved pasture	Insert point 14 in PER-1 - the clearance of regenerating indigenous vegetation for the maintenance of improved pasture Include a definition of Improved Pasture as per previous submission point Amend point 10 in PER-1 -The removal or clearance from land which was previously cleared ~~and the~~		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					~~indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old;~~		
FS184.53	Richard Milner		Support		Allow		Reject
FS404.004	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	The relief seeks to allow unfettered removal of potentially significant vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna, inconsistent with section 6(c) of the Act.	Disallow	Retain	Accept
S276.007	Russell Landcare Trust	IB-R1	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the rules do not prevent incremental loss.	Delete items 2 and 12 of PER-1 of rule IB-R1. Amend the commencement of PER-1 in rule IB-R1 so that it states: The pruning, trimming or clearance is the minimum necessary and is for one of the following: --Qualify item 6, clearance around buildings, of PER-1 of rule IB-R1 so that it applies to lawfully established existing buildings.-- Qualify item 7, clearance for single residential unit, of PER-1 of rule IB-R1 so that it does not apply to any clearance within a Significant Natural Area.		Accept in part
FS23.082	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, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land. There is a need to balance reasonable use and protection, particularly where enabling some development would better assist with protecting the balance of the land. The notified rules of the proposed plan better provide for these matters than those sought by the submitter.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.177	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
FS570.804	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
FS566.818	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
FS569.840	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
S431.103	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R1	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Delete items 2 and 12 of PER-1 of Rule IB-R1		Reject
FS23.139	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict a reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS332.103	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS404.049	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	Items 2 and 12 are inappropriately permissive	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S431.104	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R1	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 as follows: The pruning, trimming or clearance is the minimum necessary and it is for any one of the following		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS23.140	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS332.104	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
FS404.050	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The proposed qualifiers and thresholds strike an appropriate balance between protecting indigenous biodiversity values and providing for sustainable use	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.105	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R1	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend item 6 of PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 to clarify that it applies to lawfully established existing buildings.		Reject
FS23.141	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS332.105	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS404.051	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The proposed qualifiers and thresholds strike an appropriate balance between	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				protecting indigenous biodiversity values and providing for sustainable use			
S431.106	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R1	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend item 7 of PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 so that it does not apply to any clearance within a Significant Natural Area		Reject
FS23.142	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS332.106	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS404.052	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The proposed qualifiers and thresholds strike an appropriate balance between protecting indigenous biodiversity values and providing for sustainable use	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S167.021	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-R1	Support in part	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. The use of building platform (ie single residential unit) should not matter in assessing its effects relative to Indigenous vegetation. The provision for the use should be conferred from the underlying zoning. A more effective and efficient way to achieve the objective is to simply refer to 'building platforms'.	Amend rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities ~~within and outside a Significant Natural Area~~ ... 7. To allow for the construction of a ~~single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m ; 14. For existing domestic gardens15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The rule confuses density rules applying to residential units which are specified elsewhere in the Plan. It is appropriate to add further exclusions for 'existing domestic gardens' in recognition that many existing gardens include indigenous vegetation. In addition, ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be excluded in recognition that Indigenous vegetation may need to be modified for such purposes, including for access racks for planting and pest control and to release new plants.			
FS547.009	Heron Point Limited		Support in part	Support the change sought to the extent that NH-S1 should solely be applicable where activities or development are proposed within a natural hazard area. The submitter seeks that Note 2 is amended to clarify that the special information requirement solely applies to activities being undertaken within a mapped natural hazard area. This removes ambiguity when interpreting the current wording with requires a report where a site is potentially affected by natural hazards.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
FS566.383	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
S67.003	Michael John Winch	IB-R1	Oppose	I oppose Rule IB-R1/ PER-1 clauses 2, 7, 8 and 12. Clause 2: Dead trees are an important part of an indigenous ecosystem, returning nutrients to the soil and providing food and habitat for insects and fauna that feed on them. The removal of dead trees can result in significant incidental damage. Clause 7 permits vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area for the construction of a single residential unit on a title even if there is already suitable cleared land elsewhere on the title. Even if the whole of the title is a SNA, consideration should be	Delete Rule IB-R1/ PER-1 clauses 2, 8 and 12.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				given to the location of the dwelling and access to it to minimise the impact on the highest value ecological areas on the site. I accept that it is expected that a single dwelling can be constructed on a freehold title, but consider as a minimum a Controlled Activity resource consent should be obtained to ensure the dwelling minimises adverse effects on the SNA. Clause 8 permits vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area for the construction of a single residential unit if provided for in a covenant. My property at Totara North (Allot 25 Parish of Totara) is subject to a QEII covenant that provides for vegetation clearance for a future dwelling, amenity buildings and access to them. The conditions of the covenant require consultation with the QEII Trust on the siting. However, this process is outside the Resource Management Act process and may not achieve the purpose of the RMA. On my property, a resource consent would still be required under the Outstanding Landscape provisions of the Plan and this is likely to be the case on other covenanted land. Clause 12 permits vegetation clearance if approved under the Forests Act 1949. The Forests Act does not have the same purpose and principles as the RMA and cannot be expected to deliver the outcomes required under the RMA. Rule IB-R1/ PER-1 is much more permissive than rules protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes (notably NFL-R1 and NATC-R1). RMA Section 6 requires both 'significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' and 'outstanding natural features and landscapes' to be protected. The Plan should be consistent in their protection.			
FS548.016	Northland Federated		Oppose	The amendments sought would severely impede the ability of landowners to utilize their land effectively and efficiently. The	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand Inc			ability to remove dead trees and indigenous vegetation where it is necessary to do so must be retained in the Proposed District Plan.			
FS346.826	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.052	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
S529.125	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R1	Support in part	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards).	Amend Rule IB-R1 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation.		Reject
FS405.034	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendment which seeks to amend Rule IB-R1 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation, on the basis that it	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would cause unnecessary resource consents			
FS361.023	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendment which seeks to amend Rule IB-R1 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation, on the basis that it would cause unnecessary resource consents.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.2013	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2027	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2049	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S451.008	Pacific Eco-Logic	IB-R1	Support in part	Clause 6 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 should be amended as a 20m clearance zone around buildings "used for a vulnerable purpose" is not appropriate in areas where there is relatively mature forest, duneland vegetation or wetlands. Often such clearance occurs pre-emptively, setting up a cycle of vegetation change to increasing weediness and fire vulnerability Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 should be amended to recognise that 1,000m ² of vegetation clearance on a lot for the residential building and associated essential infrastructure is inappropriate on smaller lots with an indigenous cover and where clause 6 also applies. The definition of infrastructure in this context is too large.	Amend Clause 6 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 to a 5m default for indigenous vegetation . By including a definition for "indigenous vegetation", it should be clear which vegetation is not indigenous and where a larger area can be cleared (as per S451.001). A different larger setback/clearance zone is appropriate for naturalised non-native vegetation such as mixtures of gorse, pampas, wattles, tobacco weed, pines and privet. This non-native vegetation is typically far more flammable than native vegetation Amend Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 to 300m ² on smaller lots that have a primarily indigenous vegetation cover Clarify what is "essential infrastructure" in the context of Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1		Reject
FS332.195	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
FS570.1513	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
FS566.1527	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
FS569.1549	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
S250.006	Willowridge Developments Limited	IB-R1	Oppose	It is considered that the provisions as notified are overly onerous as they require an assessment of all areas of indigenous vegetation to be undertaken to determine whether compliance with the permitted activity thresholds. The provisions need to be reconsidered, with appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds proposed to allow plan users and decision-makers to easily determine compliance.	Amend IB-R1 to include maximum clearance thresholds.		Accept in part
FS332.257	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The SNA rules and environmental protections in the proposed district plan are entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.692	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
FS566.706	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
FS569.728	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
S339.029	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-R1	Not Stated	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while TACDL supports its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no	Amend Rule IB-R1 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, TACDL are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.			
FS361.021	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Willowridge Developments Limited supports the amendment sought in the submission point as it is considered that the provisions as notified are overly onerous.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S243.030	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-R1	Support in part	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, the use of building platform (i.e. single residential unit) should not matter in assessing its effects relative to Indigenous vegetation. The provision for the use should be conferred from the underlying zoning. A more effective and efficient way to achieve the objective is to simply refer to 'building platforms'.	Amend rule IB-R1 as follows: Indigenous vegetation pruning, trimming and clearance and any associated land disturbance for specified activities ~~within and outside a Significant Natural Area~~ ... 7. To allow for the construction of a ~~single residential unit on a title~~ building platform and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access and it does not exceed 1,000m;14. For existing domestic gardens15. It is for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Furthermore, the rule confuses density rules applying to residential units which are specified elsewhere in the Plan. It is appropriate to add further exclusions for 'existing domestic gardens' in recognition that many existing gardens include indigenous vegetation. In addition, ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be excluded in recognition that Indigenous vegetation may need to be modified for such purposes, including for access tracks for planting and pest control and to release new plants.			
FS570.588	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
FS566.602	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
FS569.624	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
S436.034	Northland Fish and Game Council	IB-R1	Not Stated	For the reasons set out under 'general submissions 'wetlands' of the submission (refer to submission points S436.001 and S436.002), NFGC seek amendments to include the repair and maintenance of maimai as a permitted activity and wetland maintenance and restoration work as a permitted activity. These amendments would bring the Proposed Plan in line with the NES-F.	Insert a new point 13 into Rule IB-R1, redrafting point 13 as per point 14 below: 13. It is for wetland maintenance and restoration work. 14. It is for the operation, repair and maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established: i. fences ii. infrastructure iii. buildings iv. driveways and access v. walking tracks vi. cycling tracks vii. farming tracks.viii. Maimai		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1498	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
FS346.120	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1512	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
FS569.1534	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.122	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R1	Oppose	Proposed rule IB-R1 allows indigenous vegetation clearance within and outside SNAs for a list of specified purposes which is too broad. For example: - The rule allows clearance up to 1,000m2 for building a residential unit in a SNA without requiring or considering whether existing clear areas can be used instead. - The clearance of dead trees (if they are not unsafe) or indigenous vegetation less than 10 years old can be detrimental for at risk indigenous species/habitat.	Amend Rule IB-R1		Accept
FS570.2010	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.2024	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.2046	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S148.020	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-R1	Oppose	"the removal or clearance from land which was previously cleared and the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is less than 10 years old". This unreasonably discriminates against plantation forestry where, by virtue of rotation lengths in excess of 25 years	Amend IB-R1 to provide for plantation forestry activities and rotation lengths of 28 to 35 years.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				combined with the requirements for riparian and other setbacks and ecological significance criteria that are so broad as to potentially capture the understory of plantation forests, will force plantation forestry activities into an unnecessary resource consent process to undertake a legitimate rural production activity.			
FS346.526	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
FS566.132	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
S160.017	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	IB-R1	Support in part	The submitter supports in part IB-R1 and considers that the NES PF currently provides rules around vegetation clearance including around and in SNAs. This is reflected in IB-R1-PER-1, 13.vii. However, IB-R1 PER-1, 10, by the timeline, excludes plantation forestry due to the forest rotation.	Amend IB-R1-PER1, 10 to allow for the forest rotation of 28 years.		Reject
FS346.587	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
S442.086	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R1	Oppose	Para(2) - Dead trees should not be removed from SNAs but may be felled for safety reasons. Leaving them to rot down in situ is critical for nutrient cycling and providing habitat for native species. Sub-policies 3 and 12 does not protect or maintain indigenous biodiversity when it is	Amend IB-R1: 2. To fell dead trees in SNAs that are a safety risk to life or property ~~remove...~~ felled trees should remain in situ in SNAs if it is possible, no more indigenous		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				found in a permitted activity. Allowing for vegetation clearance that is covered in the listed documents abrogates Council's authority. Sub-policy 4 is to lose and needs to refer directly to the Northland Regional Pest Plan or directions under the Biosecurity Act Sub-policy 6 - clearance within 20 meters is to far and an enormous amount significant vegetation could be cleared with 20, this should be a maximum of 10 meters or limit it to the curtilage Sub-Policy 7 - clearance of vegetation for the purposes of developing a residential unit within an SNA should be a controlled activity to enable the council to have input about what areas are to be cleared and potential mitigation / offsetting etc., Sub-policy 8 - council unlawfully abrogates its duties under ss6(c) and 31 in relation to protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity. All of the other instruments listed have there own purposes which may not necessarily reflect the requirements of the RMA Sub-Policy 9 allows for an extremely wide clearance on either side of the fence of 3.5 m. That would accommodate an exceptionally large bulldozer or tractor. This should be reduced to 1 meter either side of the fence which in effect is 2 meters in total Sub-Policy 10 - Forest & Bird acknowledge that this is down from 20 year old in the previous draft, however we remain concerned. It may be difficult to determine the age of some plant species and may require expert assessment in some cases. For example in a stunted wet area and for coastal vegetation. it is not appropriate to require expert assessor in a permitted rule and this makes the rule uncertain and difficult to enforce. F&B is also concerned that this rule will result in the loss of regenerating vegetation or enhancement plantings, for example where land changes hands or land use changes. Sub-Policy 11 - needs to be tied to a specific figure to make this certain	vegetation is cleared or trimmed than is necessary for safe felling and the clearance is undertaken in accordance with advice from a suitably qualified arborist; Delete sub-policies 3, and 12. Replace sub-policy 4 with4. Clearance for biosecurity reasons. Clearance is for the removal of material infected y unwanted organisms as declared by the Minister for Primary industries Chief Technical Officer, or an emergency declared under the Biosecurity Act 1993; or4X.The clearance is unavoidable in the course of removing pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any regional pest management plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993 or where this occurs as part of indigenous biodiversity restoration or enhancement Amend sub-policy 6 as: 6. To create or maintain a 10 20 meter setback ...Delete Sub-policy 7 and add a new controlled activity rule for new residential units in SNAs Make sub-policy 8 at least a controlled activity Amend 9. ... not exceed 3-5 1 m in width either side of the fence line Delete sub-policy 10 consider relating this to kanuka and manuka that is less than 10 years old and is only significant because of	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				or limit it to maintenance of existing firebreaks Sub-policy 13 is very broad and could include a range of clearances. The sub-policy is uncertain at the moment because it is left to the discretion of the person undertaking the activity to determine how much clearance should occur.	the risk of myrtle rust or reduce it vegetation where it is possible to prove that it is no older than 5 years old. Amend sub-policy 11 11.Maintenance of firebreaks to manage fire risk. Amend sub-policy 13 as 13. It is for the operation, repair and maintenance of the following activities and is within 1 meter (either side) of the ...		
FS346.697	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
S442.152	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R1	Support	Clause 6 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 should be amended as a 20m clearance zone around buildings "used for a vulnerable purpose" is not appropriate in areas where there is relatively mature forest, duneland vegetation or wetlands. Often such clearance occurs pre-emptively, setting up a cycle of vegetation change to increasing weediness and fire vulnerability Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 should be amended to recognise that 1,000m ² of vegetation clearance on a lot for the residential building and associated essential infrastructure is inappropriate on smaller lots with an indigenous cover and where clause 6 also applies. The definition of infrastructure in this context is too large.	Amend Clause 6 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 to a 5m default for indigenous vegetation . By including a definition for "indigenous vegetation", it should be clear which vegetation is not indigenous and where a larger area can be cleared (as per S451.001). A different larger setback/clearance zone is appropriate for naturalised non-native vegetation such as mixtures of gorse, pampas, wattles, tobacco weed, pines and privet. This non-native vegetation is typically far more flammable than native vegetation Amend Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1 to 300m ² on smaller lots that have a primarily indigenous vegetation cover Clarify what is "essential infrastructure" in the context of Clause 7 in PER-1 of Rule IB-R1.		Reject
FS346.763	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S442.182	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R1	Support	(2) - Dead trees in SNAs should only be felled if they pose a significant safety risk as standing dead trees provide important roost sites for threatened native species such as bats. Where dead trees are felled they must be left to decompose in situ to enable nutrient cycling and provide important habitat (7) - Clearance of vegetation for the purposes of developing a residential unit within an SNA should be a controlled activity to ensure adequate consideration has been given to avoiding and/or mitigating adverse effects (9) - The width of permitted clearance for fence lines is excessive. While it may be necessary to drive posts using a tractor you do not need tractor clearance down either side of the fenceline (10) - Recognise the need for landowners to be able to keep their land in a "cleared" state without needing resource consent but the time frame should be reduced to 5 year old vegetation and there has to be an available evidential basis to establish the age e.g. google earth, photos or other records. (12) - The Forests Act does not have the same purpose or principles as the RMA so the council cannot rely on decisions made under this Act.	Delete (2) and (12). Delete (7) and add a new controlled activity rule for new residential units in SNAs Amend (9) ... "not exceed 4 m in total width" Amend (10) to reduce it to vegetation where it is possible to establish that it is under 5 years old without expert input.		Reject
FS346.793	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
S67.004	Michael John Winch	IB-R1	Oppose	Clause 7 permits vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area for the construction of a single residential unit on a title even if	Delete Rule IB-R1/ PER-1 clause 7 and replace with Controlled and Discretionary Rules as follows: Controlled Activity: Vegetation		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				there is already suitable cleared land elsewhere on the title. Even if the whole of the title is a SNA, consideration should be given to the location of the dwelling and access to it to minimise the impact on the highest value ecological areas on the site. I accept that it is expected that a single dwelling can be constructed on a freehold title, but consider as a minimum a Controlled Activity resource consent should be obtained to ensure the dwelling minimises adverse effects on the SNA. Rule IB-R1/ PER-1 is much more permissive than rules protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes (notably NFL-R1 and NATC-R1). RMA Section 6 requires both 'significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna' and 'outstanding natural features and landscapes' to be protected. The Plan should be consistent in their protection.	clearance within a Significant Natural Area to allow for the construction of a single residential unit and essential associated onsite infrastructure and access on a title where there is no existing cleared land suitable for the purpose and the vegetation clearance does not exceed 1,000m2. Matters of control to include location, extent of vegetation clearance, control of introduced plants and animals (including pets), whether an existing covenant provides for the vegetation clearance, and methods of avoiding or mitigating adverse effects on and protecting the ecological values of the SNA. Discretionary Activity where the Controlled Activity Rule is not complied with.		
FS346.827	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.053	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
S527.006	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-R1	Not Stated	Rule IB-R1 allows indigenous vegetation clearance within and outside SNAs for a list of specified purposes which is too broad. For example: - The rule allows clearance up to 1,000m2 for building a residential unit in a SNA without requiring or considering whether existing clear areas can be used instead.	Amend IB-R1 to make more restrictive (inferred)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- The clearance of dead trees (if they are not unsafe) or indigenous vegetation less than 10 years old can be detrimental for at risk indigenous species/habitat.			
FS566.1868	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S454.087	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	IB-R1	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this rule as it provides for vegetation clearance to ensure the safe and efficient operation of infrastructure, such as the National Grid.	Retain IB-R1.		Accept in part
FS369.362	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy supports the inclusion of provisions which provide for vegetation clearance to ensure the safe and efficient operation of infrastructure.	Allow	Allow	Accept in part
S333.021	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-R2	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case	Delete Rule IB-R2		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S355.022	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-R2	Support in part	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R2 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S168.029	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R2	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.022	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R2.	Reject
S222.029	Wendover Two Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives,	Delete Rule IB-R2	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S473.004	Adams-Te Whata Whanau Trust	IB-R2	Support in part	if only one papakainga house is proposed to be built the limit should be 1,000sq metres and not 500sq metres so that the permitted residential unit for Maori is not less than a single residential unit of a title under IB-R1. As Maori tend to have bigger families and require a bigger house this restriction appears to be unnecessarily discriminatory.	amend IB-R2 PER-1 2. 1,000m2 for the first residential unit, 500m2 for subsequent units	Accept
S479.015	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-R2	Support	A number of our sites of interest has established indigenous vegetation providing important habitat for fauna. The extent and health of this habitat demonstrates how we have been exercising and performing our role as kaitiaki and managing this resource for current and future generations of our whanau. We have concerns with the provisions for EIB, as they do not provide sufficient enablement for the use and occupation of land. As FNDC is aware, whenua Māori has been alienated through decades of legislative processes resulting in the marginalisation of Māori from their lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu and taonga. For these reasons, the enablement of use and development to support the occupation of whenua is required. While IB-R2 provides for limited clearance of land for papakāinga, the thresholds do not sufficiently enable the development of land for papakāinga development, particularly	Amend the thresholds detailed in IB-R2, to reflect the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki, and provide for tangata whenua to use and occupy their land.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				where there is more than one residential unit being constructed. In our view, this does not recognise the complex nature of multiple ownership of whenua Māori land. In our case, our land was converted through Māori Affairs legislation in the 50's to General Title, and although two of these blocks have remained in general title the land is ancestral and provides for the wellbeing of our wider whanau. Finally, it is noted that the section 32 does not include analysis on the suitability of the thresholds proposed, and in the absence of this, we seek flexibility in the thresholds to provide for the wellbeing of our whanau.		
S479.017	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-R2	Oppose	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R2 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally	Accept in part
S339.028	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-R2	Not Stated	TACDL are concerned that the provisions for ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity do not provide sufficient enablement for the use and occupation of land. While IB-R2 provides for limited clearance of land for papakāinga, the thresholds do not sufficiently enable the development of land for papakāinga development, particularly where there is more than one residential unit being constructed. In TACDL's view, this does not recognise the complex nature of multiple ownership of Māori land or in TACDL's case, the need to provide for the	Amend the thresholds detailed in Rule IB-R2, so that they appropriately recognise and provide for the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				social and economic wellbeing of its many uri (members). In addition to the above, it is TACDL's view that Māori land is already significantly burdened by complex legislative processes and the many barriers to undertake development that it considers these provisions to inadequately recognise and respond to that context. Further, it is noted that the section 32 does not include analysis on the suitability of the thresholds proposed, and in the absence of this, TACDL seek flexibility in the thresholds.		
S339.030	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-R2	Not Stated	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while TACDL supports its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, TACDL are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend Rule IB-R2 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S529.126	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R2	Support in part	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can	Amend Rule IB-R2 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards).			
FS176.8	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Oppose	The submitter seeks relief that would capture the understory of a plantation forest which would be onerous and unnecessary. The NES-PF and NPS-IB establish an appropriate national framework for managing these issues.	Disallow		Accept
FS108.14	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The NES-PF provides the appropriate provisions and the NPS-IB provides guidance on harvesting plantation forestry. Further rules is onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow		Accept
FS405.035	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Oppose	Ballantyne & Agnew opposes the requested amendment which seeks to amend Rule IB-R1 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation, on the basis that it would cause unnecessary resource consents	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS361.024	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendment which seeks to amend Rule IB-R1 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation, on the basis that it would cause unnecessary resource consents.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.2014	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2028	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
FS569.2050	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S559.015	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-R2	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-R2 and redraft in conjunction with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part
FS151.148	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.261	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2205	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.042	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2219	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
FS569.2241	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
S355.020	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-R2	Support in part	A number of our sites of interest has established indigenous vegetation providing important habitat for fauna. The extent and health of this habitat demonstrates how we have been exercising and performing our role as kaitiaki and managing this resource for current and future generations of our whanau. We have concerns with the provisions for EIB, as they do not provide sufficient enablement for the use and occupation of land. As FNDC is aware, whenua Māori has been alienated through decades of legislative processes resulting in the marginalisation of Māori from their lands, waters, sites, wāhi tapu and taonga. For these reasons, the enablement of use and development to support the occupation of whenua is required. While IB-R2 provides for limited clearance of land for papakāinga, the thresholds do not sufficiently enable the development of land for papakāinga development, particularly where there is more than one residential unit being constructed. In our view, this does not recognise the complex nature of multiple ownership of whenua Māori land. In our case, our land was converted through Māori Affairs legislation in the 50's to General Title, and although two of these blocks have remained in general title the land is ancestral and provides for the wellbeing of our wider whanau. Finally, it is noted that the section 32 does not include analysis on the suitability of the thresholds proposed, and in the absence of this, we seek flexibility in the thresholds to provide for the wellbeing of our whanau.	Amend the thresholds detailed in IB-R2, to reflect the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki, and provide for tangata whenua to use and occupy their land.		Accept in part
FS196.38	Joe Carr		Support	Enables the use of Iwi land	Allow		Accept in part
S250.007	Willowridge Developments Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	It is considered that the provisions as notified are overly onerous as they require an assessment of all areas of indigenous vegetation to be undertaken to determine whether compliance with the permitted	Amend IB-R2 to include maximum clearance thresholds.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity thresholds. The provisions need to be reconsidered, with appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds proposed to allow plan users and decision-makers to easily determine compliance.			
FS332.258	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The SNA rules and environmental protections in the proposed district plan are entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.693	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
FS566.707	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
FS569.729	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S243.031	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R2		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.589	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
FS566.603	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
FS569.625	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
S167.022	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-R2	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R2		Reject
FS566.384	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
S279.005	Manu Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R3	Oppose	This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance. The t. It is a perverse to penalise such a landowner if they wish to then carry out a land use activity which requires vegetation clearance or land disturbance while at the same time still retaining or protecting the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site.	Amend to allow for an increase in the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as provided for in the SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision rule. This would reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.		Reject
S333.022	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-R3	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation	Delete Rule IB-R3		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S355.023	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-R3	Support in part	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified	Amend IB-R3 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Reject
S168.030	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners;	Delete Rule IB-R3	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and Setar Thirty Six Limited significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S187.023	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R3	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S222.030	Wendover Two Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R3	Accept
S479.018	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-R3	Oppose	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R3 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S463.032	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-R3	Support	In the Special Purpose Zone - Kauri Cliffs, numerous areas of ecological restoration are being progressed at any one time. The allowance for 100 m ² of clearance in a SNA per calendar year is considered appropriate. The activity status being discretionary once this threshold is exceeded is considered appropriate to avoid, remedy and mitigate the effects of further vegetation removal where required.	Retain Rule IB-R3	Reject
S339.031	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-R3	Not Stated	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while TACDL supports its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, TACDL are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend Rule IB-R3 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S255.004	Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R3	Oppose	This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. It is a perverse to penalise such a landowner if they wish to then carry out a land use activity which requires vegetation clearance or land disturbance while at the same time still retaining or protecting the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site. Increasing vegetation clearance limits could reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.	Amend rule to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place (such as provided for in SUB-R6 Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS58.6	Harold Corbett		Support	Increase the permitted activity clearance and land disturbance allowances so as not to unduly penalise landowners who, through their efforts, created or significantly enhanced biodiversity in the area. Refer also original submission S487 which suggest activity levels.	Allow		Reject
S559.016	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-R3	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.	Delete IB-R3 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept
FS151.149	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.262	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land.	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.2206	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
FS348.043	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2220	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
FS569.2242	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
S364.046	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-R3	Oppose	Excessive clearance of indigenous vegetation can create further fragmentation and isolation of indigenous ecosystems communities. The Director-General considers that allowing 100m ² of indigenous vegetation clearance per site in any calendar year is enabling the incremental loss of SNAs. It is acknowledged that some removal of indigenous vegetation is necessary, but only in circumstances that can be or are already identified in the District Plan. The removal of 100m ² of indigenous vegetation within a SNA per site/year with no reason should require resource consent and should not be allowed as a permitted activity.	Delete Rule IB-R3 and amend the rules to only allow the removal of indigenous vegetation as a permitted activity in specific circumstances that have an identified need. The removal of indigenous vegetation for non-specified purposes should require resource consent as a non-complying activity.		Accept in part
FS225.3	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The current rule will enable the incremental loss of SNAs.	Allow		Accept in part
FS339.052	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Ensuring vegetation clearance is appropriately controlled is critical to protecting eco-systems and related cultural values.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS361.025	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendment to delete Rule IB-R3 and amend the rules to only allow the removal of indigenous vegetation as a permitted activity in specific circumstances on the basis that it is overly conservative.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1127	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
FS346.186	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
FS566.1141	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
FS569.1163	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
S276.008	Russell Landcare Trust	IB-R3	Support in part	Protection and recognition of indigenous biodiversity is inadequate and the rules do not prevent incremental loss.	Amend PER-1 of IB-R3, clearance within a Significant Natural Area, so that it provides for a total clearance of no more than 100 square metres in any 10 year period. Amend clause 2 of PER-2 of rule IB-R3 so that it provides for a total clearance of no more than 100 square metres in any 10 year period.		Reject
FS23.083	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, the provisions proposed by the submitter appear to go too far and would constrain a reasonable use being made of land. There is a need to balance reasonable use and protection, particularly where enabling some development would better assist with protecting the balance of the land. The notified rules of the proposed plan better provide for these matters than those sought by the submitter.	Disallow	disallow relief sought	Accept
FS332.178	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
FS570.805	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
FS566.819	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
FS569.841	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
S431.107	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R3	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend PER-1 of IB-R3 so that it provides for a total clearance of no more than 100 square metres in any 10 year period.		Reject
FS23.143	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS332.107	Russell Protection Society		Support	The original submission aligns with our values. The Russell Protection Society has a purpose of promoting wise and sustainable development that compliments the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS404.053	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The proposed qualifiers and thresholds strike an appropriate balance between protecting indigenous biodiversity values and providing for sustainable use.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S431.108	John Andrew Riddell	IB-R3	Not Stated	The permitted activity rules applying to ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity are too permissive and do not achieve the purpose of the Act	Amend clause 2 of PER-2 of rule IB-R3 so that it provides for a total clearance of no more than 100 square metres in any 10 year period.		Reject
FS23.144	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Oppose to the extent the relief goes beyond what is required to give effect to the higher order policy documents. There is no need to repeat those	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provisions within the District Plan. Some of the changes sought would unnecessarily and inappropriately restrict s reasonable use being able to be made of land.			
FS332.108	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
FS361.026	Willowridge Developments Limited		Oppose	Willowridge Developments Limited opposes the requested amendment to clause 2 PER-2 of rule IB-R3 so that it provides for a total clearance of no more than 100 square metres in any 10-year period, on the basis that it is overly conservative	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Reject
FS404.054	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The proposed qualifiers and thresholds strike an appropriate balance between protecting indigenous biodiversity values and providing for sustainable use.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S511.068	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-R3	Oppose	Allowing for yearly 100m2 clearance of vegetation likely to result in incremental degradation and loss of SNAs. Restricting to 50m2 clearance every 5-10 years in lower value SNAs would achieve a better balance. NOTE inconsistency between management of SNAs inland and high natural character areas in the coastal environment to which a 50m2 over 10 year limit applies	Amend to list the most sensitive types of areas of indigenous biodiversity in the Far North and reduce the threshold for clearance to 50 square meters every 5 years. For other less sensitive types of indigenous biodiversity keep set at 100 square meters every 5 years		Reject
FS23.257	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	Disagree that the extent of clearance and frequency of clearance should be reduced to the extent sought in the submission. While agreeing that 100m2 every year, may not be appropriate, retaining 100m2 but limited to every 2 or 3 years may be more appropriate.	Disallow	Disallow relief sought, retain 100m2, but reduce frequency.	Accept
FS164.068	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.		strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	
FS548.159	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers believes that the notified clearance limit of 100m2 per year is an appropriate limit. Federated Farmers considers the relief sought overly restrictive and that the reduced clearance limits would negatively impact on landowners' ability to use the land productively.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1639	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
FS566.1653	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
FS569.1675	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
S542.013	Marianna Fenn	IB-R3	Oppose	Allowing for yearly 100m2 clearance of vegetation likely to result in incremental degradation and loss of SNAs. Some SNA areas may be so rare or vulnerable that consent should be required for any clearance or disturbance	Amend to reduce the threshold for clearance to 50 square meters every 5 years; and Separately identify particularly SNAs that include particularly rare or vulnerable indigenous biodiversity and require consent for any clearance or disturbance of these areas		Reject
FS393.031	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Oppose	The PDP thresholds are considered to adequately sustain the presence of SNA without degradation of this resource.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS401.039	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Oppose	The PDP thresholds are considered to adequately sustain the presence of SNA without degradation of this resource	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS570.2141	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
FS346.876	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2155	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
FS569.2177	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
S250.008	Willowridge Developments Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	It is considered that the provisions as notified are overly onerous as they require an assessment of all areas of indigenous vegetation to be undertaken to determine whether compliance with the permitted activity thresholds. The provisions need to be reconsidered, with appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds proposed to allow plan users and decision-makers to easily determine compliance.	Amend IB-R3 to include maximum clearance thresholds.		Accept in part
FS332.259	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The SNA rules and environmental protections in the proposed district plan are entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.694	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
FS566.708	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.730	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S243.032	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R3		Reject
FS570.590	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
FS566.604	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
FS569.626	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.123	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R3	Oppose	Rules IB-R3 and IB-R4 allow clearance of indigenous vegetation up to 100m2 per calendar year in areas confirmed (by ecological assessment) to be SNAs and in areas where a report has not been obtained. The cumulative effect of this rule, over time, would allow significant amounts	Amend rule IB-R3		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of indigenous vegetation to be eliminated. In areas that are considered not to meet the criteria for a SNA, rule IB-R4 allows clearance of 500m ² in most zones, and up to 5,000m ² clearance of indigenous vegetation in rural production and horticulture zone if not in a remnant forest.			
FS570.2011	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.2025	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.2047	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S529.127	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R3	Support in part	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards).	Amend Rule IB-R3 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation		Reject
FS570.2015	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2029	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
FS569.2051	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S442.087	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R3	Support in part	Allowing for yearly 100m2 clearance of vegetation likely to result in incremental degradation and loss of SNAs. Restricting to 50m2 clearance every 5-10 years in lower value SNAs would achieve a better balance. NOTE inconsistency between management of SNAs inland and high natural character areas in the coastal environment to which a 50m2 over 10 year limit applies.	Amend to list the most sensitive types of areas of indigenous biodiversity in the Far North and reduce the threshold for clearance to 50 square meters every 5 years. For other less sensitive types of indigenous biodiversity keep set at 100 square meters every 5 years.		Reject
FS346.698	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
S442.183	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R3	Oppose	Allowing for yearly 100m2 clearance of vegetation likely to result in incremental degradation and loss of SNAs. Some SNA areas may be so rare or vulnerable that consent should be required for any clearance or disturbance.	Amend to reduce the threshold for clearance to 50 square meters every 5 years; and Separately identify particularly SNAs that include particularly rare or vulnerable indigenous biodiversity and require consent for any clearance or disturbance of these areas.		Reject
FS346.794	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S167.023	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-R3	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R3		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.385	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
S527.007	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-R3	Oppose	Allows clearance of indigenous vegetation up to 100m2 per calendar year in areas confirmed (by ecological assessment) to be SNAs and in areas where a report has not been obtained. The cumulative effect of this rule, over time, would allow significant amounts of indigenous vegetation to be eliminated.	Amend IB-R3 to make more restrictive (inferred)		Reject
FS566.1869	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S69.001	Robyn Josephine Baker	IB-R4	Oppose	It is totally unacceptable for FNDC to essentially 'take' land without market rate compensation. These rules appear to have the same effect as the previously tabled SNA proposals which were supposedly discarded when the ratepayers made their feelings very clear to the government. We have purchased this land and worked hard to clear it of noxious vegetation this includes, at our own expense and physical effort, removing gorse, tobacco weed, Australian Sedge and Ragwort. It is completely unreasonable that we should have to pay an ecologist to prove that our small amount of regenerated 'Native Bush' is not an SNA. Given that our Title already includes covenanted land that we are protecting - as is the case for most land owners in the area. We believe that FNDC should not be legally allowed to commandeer any further land by underhand means as is proposed. That these policies are being forced down from 'the top', where 'the top' exists outside of NZ, makes a complete mockery of NZ as a supposed democracy. SUB-R17 serves no useful purpose. A subdivided SNA is still a SNA.	Amend IB-R4 PER-2 to allow unlimited area to be cleared per calendar year in Rural Production Zone. Or at a minimum, whatever the previous district plan allowed.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S77.006	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S40.007	Martin John Yurelich	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S41.007	Joel Vieviorka	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping,	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S59.001	Diane Gardiner	IB-R4	Oppose	Rule IB-R4 2i provides for clearance outside an SNA where it does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period: Rural Production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone and Treaty Settlement Land Overlay - 5,000m² if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m² in a remnant forest. Landowner's property includes a non-remnant forest and this is regrowth of Ti tree over productive fertile land. We clear the land, allow regeneration and maintain weed control. Change or abolish the stated land area relating to non-remnant forest as it will affect many livelihoods in the Far North.	Amend or delete the land area stated for non-remnant forest. Request that ODP provisions be retained or increase the threshold before resource consent is required.	Accept in part
S163.010	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is	Amend the Plan: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S182.017	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association	IB-R4	Oppose	oppose limiting the clearance of indigenous vegetation in the Rural production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone and the Treaty Settlement Land Overlay to 5,000m2 if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m2 in a remnant forest. retain the 2ha limit in the operative district plan.	Amend Rule IB-R4 PER-1 2.i. Rural Production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone and Treaty Settlement Land Overlay - ~~5,000m2~~ 20,000m2 if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m2 in a remnant forest;	Reject
S58.001	Colin James McLeod	IB-R4	Oppose	The submitter opposes the permitted standard of 500m2 for indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a significant natural area, in zones other than Rural Production, Horticulture, Māori Purpose and Treaty Settlement Land overlay, over a 5-year period, and considers the area to be too small.	Delete IB-R4 Per-2(i) (inferred). "Overturn the decision to clear only 500m2 in 5 years. Allow any number of activities to take place on newly cleared land with permits perhaps. Regrowth of indigenous vegetation could be allowed but weeds should be managed and proff of this should be welcomed by the council and wider community."	Reject
S377.007	Rua Hatu Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S410.007	Kerry-Anne Smith	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S411.007	Roger Myles Smith	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S470.007	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Angelika Eveline Letz			concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	
S161.006	Shanon Garton	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S333.023	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	As above in the reasons for the changes to the Overview section. In addition, the rule includes the requirement that "a report has been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the	Delete Rule IB-R4	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken". This requirement lacks precision necessary for a permitted activity, and imposes an unfair cost and burden on landowners to identify SNA areas. The rule is unfairly structured such that the areas are assumed SNA unless proven otherwise by landowners and, as such, does not satisfy the requirements of section 32 of the RMA 1991.		
S355.024	Wakaiti Dalton	IB-R4	Support in part	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R4 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S187.024	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: reasons provided in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity overview section; and how areas are assumed SNA unless proven otherwise by landowners, and, as such,	Delete Rule IB-R4	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				does not satisfy the requirements of section 32 of the RMA 1991.		
S395.007	Sean Jozef Vercammen	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S222.031	Wendover Two Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: - Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and - Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated	Delete Rule IB-R4	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, the rule includes the requirement that "a report has been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken". This requirement lacks precision necessary for a permitted activity, and imposes an unfair cost and burden on landowners to identify SNA areas. The rule is unfairly structured such that the areas are assumed SNA unless proven otherwise by landowners and, as such, does not satisfy the requirements of section 32 of the RMA 1991.		
S472.044	Michael Foy	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S473.002	Adams-Te Whata Whanau Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	my concern is that there is a blanket limit of 100 square metres where no report has been obtained from a suitable qualified and experienced ecologist. There is one situation in which it would be very unwise to	amend IB-R4 PER-2 Note: This rule shall not apply to fire-breaks urgently to prevent the spread of fire to indigenous and other bush/ forest areas.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				set a limit and that when a fire- break is urgently required to prevent a fire spreading to large areas of indigenous fauna/bush or commercial forest plantations.		
S479.019	Tracy and Kenneth Dalton	IB-R4	Oppose	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while we support its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, we are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend IB-R4 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S547.007	LJ King Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	Accept in part
S544.007	Kelvin Richard Horsford	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	- Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S348.013	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend the PDP to reflect the submission as follows: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Modify the approach to work in partnership with landowners (given that the Council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB) - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - Include the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.	Accept in part
S439.007	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical	Amend Rule IB-R4: - to acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - to work in partnership with landowners given that the council is required to undertake	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB - to provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - to provide the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice if owners wish to protect their bush, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants - to make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP	
S339.032	Te Aupōuri Commercial Development Ltd	IB-R4	Not Stated	The PDP excludes the mapping that was released as part of the Draft Plan, and while TACDL supports its removal, it is now unclear how these provisions will be applied, assessed and monitored. Rules IB-R1, IB-R3 and IB-R4 all reference SNA as permitted activity rules. Given there is no mapping to identify these areas, there is no means to assess compliance with the permitted standards except by providing a site-specific report prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist which is considered to be inappropriate as a permitted activity status. For these reasons, TACDL are concerned with this approach and seek amendments to the provisions as they have been notified.	Amend Rule IB-R4 to include maximum clearance thresholds to apply to indigenous biodiversity more generally.	Accept in part
S255.005	Arahia Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R4	Oppose	This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. PER-1 imposes a cost burden to engage a "suitably qualified and experienced ecologist" to meet the permitted standard. It is perverse to penalise a landowner if they wish to carry out a land use activity if the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site remains protected and retained.	Amend rule to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place (such as provided for in SUB-R6 Environmental Benefit Subdivision rule).	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS112.7	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. There should be an increased amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for landowners if the majority of the indigenous vegetation remains protected and retained.	Allow		Accept in part
FS58.7	Harold Corbett		Support	Increase the amount of permitted activity (clearance and land disturbance) to incentivise/reward landowners who have/are protecting or wanting to protect/enhance/create areas of indigenous vegetation. Refer also S487 which suggests activity levels.	Allow		Accept in part
FS28.019	Dr John L Craig		Support	The area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m2 in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	Allow	Amend IB-R4 to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as under SUB-R6.	Accept in part
S357.036	Sean Frieling	IB-R4	Oppose	Despite clear opposition to SNA mapping, provisions in the PDP have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowners to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA. None of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. Overall rural landowners have of their own volition increased not decreased the areas of SNA. Council is now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to restore wetlands, waterways and bush areas. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA in the District, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. Modify the approach to mapping and identification of SNA in accordance with the draft NPS for indigenous biodiversity. Insert incentives, not disincentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land. Amend the options for bush protection. Make SNA mapping available to the public.		Accept in part
FS24.41	Lynley Newport		Support	agree with the sentiment. too much restrictive regulation and not enough incentives.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S148.022	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Requires a landowner needing to undertake any indigenous vegetation clearance in excess of 100m ² to engage a suitable ecologist to confirm that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria. These compliance costs are potentially onerous and pushes the costs of a public good onto private landowners. The section 32 analysis for Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity acknowledges the downsides of this approach and it is certainly contrary to Policy IB-P5.	Delete the requirement for a landowner to obtain an ecologist's report proving an area is not an SNA, or in the alternative establish a process whereby Council fully funds such reports when associated with primary production activity.		Accept
FS88.5	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow in part		Accept
FS85.16	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	Pf Olsen supports SFNZL submission and agrees that the cost for land use to have a suitable ecologist to assess if the area is an SNA or not places an unreasonable burden and it is inconsistent with Policy IB-P5. Besides, it is not fair for the land use to be burdened with this cost, if the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS IB) has now been released and includes new SNA criteria to be applied nationally. It also requires that District Plans must identify all areas that meet SNA criteria, including the location and a map of the area.	Allow		Accept
FS354.116	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	Requiring an ecologists report at the landowners cost when the council has not included SNA's in the plan is an unfair cost to landowners.	Allow	Allow S148.022	Accept
FS346.528	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.134	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
S196.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	IB-R4	Support in part	Some rules are overly restrictive, particularly if indigenous vegetation is not an SNA. Consider whether Rural Lifestyle Zone is most appropriately lumped together with "all other zones" or whether there should be some recognition that lot sizes in this zone might be as large as 4ha. Support the default to discretionary activity status where performance standards are not achieved.	Amend IB-R4 PER-1, clause 2: It does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period: i. Rural Production Zone, Horticulture Zone, Māori Purpose Zone and Treat Settlement Zone Overlay - 5,000m² 1 hectare if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m² in a remnant forest; ii. Rural Lifestyle Zone, 1,000m² if not a remnant forest, otherwise 500m² in a remnant forest; iii. All other zones - 500m ² Retain the default to discretionary activity status where performance standards are not achieved.		Reject
FS171.3	Trish Routley		Support	I support the submission I agree some rules are overly restrictive, particularly if indigenous vegetation is not an SNA. Consider whether Rural Lifestyle Zone is most appropriately lumped together with "all other zones" or whether there should be some recognition that lot sizes in this zone might be as large as 4ha. Support the default to discretionary activity status where performance standards are not achieved. Amend IB-R4 PER-1, clause 2: It does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period: i. Rural Production Zone, Horticulture Zone, Māori Purpose Zone and Treat Settlement Zone Overlay - 5,000m ² 1 hectare if not in a	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				remnant forest, otherwise 500m2 in a remnant forest; ii. Rural Lifestyle Zone, 1,000m2 if not a remnant forest, otherwise 500m2 in a remnant forest; iii. All other zones - 500m2 Retain the default to discretionary activity status where performance standards are not achieved.			
FS332.219	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Threshold of 500m2 necessary to protect coastal bush escarpments.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept
S541.007	Elbury Holdings	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS155.53	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S485.046	Elbury Holdings	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		
FS155.54	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S519.046	Elbury Holdings	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		Accept in part
FS155.55	Fiona King		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S287.004	Tristan Simpkin	IB-R4	Oppose	This rule therefore means that even the smallest group of trees will require an ecologist report, adding several thousand dollars to many home builds across the district. Rules like this are not helping housing become more affordable at all.	Delete the rule in its entirety.		Reject
FS29.16	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree with deleting this rule. We never used to require ecologist reports and then in the last year these are becoming more and more frequent and adding several thousands of dollars to projects we're working on.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.875	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
FS566.889	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
FS569.911	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
S279.006	Manu Burkhardt Macrae	IB-R4	Support	This rule provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and land disturbance on sites where there is a lot of indigenous vegetation and/or significant natural area by virtue of the fact that the land owner has retained or protected it. Per-1 imposes a cost burden to engage a 'suitably qualified and experienced ecologist to meet the permitted standard. Per-2 provides for an inadequate amount of clearance and disturbance without a report. It is a perverse to penalise such a landowner if they wish to then carry out a land use activity which requires vegetation clearance or land disturbance while at the same time still retaining or protecting the majority of the indigenous vegetation or significant natural area on the site.	Provide for an increase in the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as provided for in the SUB-R6 Environmental benefit subdivision rule. This would reward landowners who already have protection and incentivise landowners to protect.		Accept in part
FS85.17	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	Pf Olsen opposes this submission. The fact the cost for land use to have a suitable ecologist to assess if the area is an SNA or not places an unreasonable burden and it is inconsistent with Policy IB-P5. Besides, it is not fair for the land use to be burdened with this cost, if the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS IB) has now been released and includes new SNA criteria to be applied nationally. It also requires that District Plans must identify all areas that meet SNA criteria, including the location and a map of the area. Rule IB-R4 should be deleted or amended it to not require consent holders	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to obtain an ecologist's report to prove that the indigenous vegetation is not a SNA.			
FS28.020	Dr John L Craig		Support	The area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m2 in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	Allow	Amend IB-R4 to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as under SUB-R6.	Accept in part
S511.069	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-R4	Support in part	Per-1 Remnant Forests should qualify as SNAs under the broad RPS definition and as a likely Tier 1 SNA under the Forest & Bird proposed framework. The extent of clearance allowed as a permitted activity is excessive, particularly given the climate and biodiversity crises and the national level focus on revegetation. Allowable clearance will add up to very large areas where land is held in multiple titles and over longer time periods. Justifiable reasons for clearance could be provided by clearly defined exceptions related to particular activities e.g. maintaining fences and cleared farmland. How this rule will look will also be determined by weather SNAs are mapped in general. If they are not then will need to delete all threshold rules and restrict clearance in all identified / mapped SNAs and the list of important indigenous biodiversity Per-2 Clearance of up to 100m2 in a potential SNA will result in incremental loss and degradation. Without the assessment then it will be very difficult to determine if significant natural areas are being cleared Also the note is inappropriate. This note will last the life of the plan and will cause plan users confusion	Amend Per-1(2)(l) to limit permitted clearance to 500 square meters every 5 years or restrict it to clearly defined purposes e.g., maintaining cleared pasture and fence lines. Delete Per-1(2)(i) references to clearance within a remnant forest Amend Per-2(2) to limit clearance of up to 50m2 every 5 years. Delete Note		Accept in part
FS109.12	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	NZAAA seeks to have the limits in the current operative plan retained	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS164.069	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
FS548.160	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers believes that the notified clearance limits in PER-1 (2)(i) and PER-2(2) are appropriate limits. They achieve a balance between landowners rights to make decisions regarding what they do with their property and protecting areas of indigenous biodiversity.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.1640	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
FS566.1654	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
FS569.1676	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
S442.088	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R4	Support in part	Per-1 Remnant Forests should qualify as SNAs under the broad RPS definition and as a likely Tier 1 SNA under the Forest & Bird proposed framework. The extent of clearance allowed as a permitted activity is excessive, particularly given the climate and biodiversity crises and the national level focus on revegetation. Allowable clearance will add up to very	Amend Per-1(2)(i) to limit permitted clearance to 500 square meters every 5 years or restrict it to clearly defined purposes e.g., maintaining cleared pasture and fence lines. Delete Per-1(2)(i) references to clearance within a remnant forest Amend Per-2(2) to limit clearance of up to 50m2 every 5 years. Delete Note.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				large areas where land is held in multiple titles and over longer time periods. Justifiable reasons for clearance could be provided by clearly defined exceptions related to particular activities e.g. maintaining fences and cleared farmland. How this rule will look will also be determined by whether SNAs are mapped in general. If they are not then will need to delete all threshold rules and restrict clearance in all identified / mapped SNAs and the list of important indigenous biodiversity Per-2 Clearance of up to 100m2 in a potential SNA will result in incremental loss and degradation. Without the assessment then it will be very difficult to determine if significant natural areas are being cleared Also the note is inappropriate. This note will last the life of the plan and will cause plan users confusion.			
FS109.13	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		Oppose	NZAAA seeks to have the limits in the current operative plan retained	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.699	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
S559.017	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-R4	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in the Far North outside of the Crown owned	Delete IB-R4 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.			
FS151.150	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.263	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2207	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.044	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2221	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
FS569.2243	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
S131.001	Lynley Newport	IB-R4	Support in part	The submitter considers IB-R4 to be overly restrictive, particularly if the indigenous vegetation is not SNA and there is an ecologist report confirming this. The submitter also considers that the Rural Lifestyle zone should not be with all other zones as the lot sizes in this zone might be as large as 4ha.	Amend IB-R4 to read: PER-1 1. A report has been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken; and 2. It does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period: 1. Rural Production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone and Treaty Settlement Land Overlay - 1 hectare if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500m2 in a remnant forest;		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					2. Rural Lifestyle Zone - 1000m ² if not in remnant forest, otherwise 500m ² in a remnant forest; 3. All other zones - 500m ² .		
Here FS196.39	Joe Carr		Support	would achieve a more balanced approach	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.83	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS332.225	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Indigenous vegetation clearance controls in PDP are entirely appropriate.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
S463.033	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	The 500 m ² limit per 5-year period (i.e., an average of 100 m ² per year) that would apply to the Special Purpose Zones under rule IB-R4 PER-1(2)(ii) is not supported. In the case of the KCZ Golf Living subzone, development will largely (if not entirely) avoid Significant Natural Areas ("SNAs"). However, the scale of development (up to 60 residential lots) anticipated by the Proposed Plan means clearance outside SNAs could easily exceed the modest permitted limit, by way of unavoidable impacts on scattered indigenous vegetation. Given the purposes and anticipated development in the KCZ, WBF considers that this rule could appropriately be amended to provide for the KCZ Golf Living subzone (and potentially, for other Special Purpose Zones) similarly to the allowance made under sub-clause PER-1(2)(i).	Amend point 2. of PER-1 of Rules IB-R4 as follows: 2. It does not exceed the following amounts per site over a 5-year period: i. Rural Production zone, Horticulture zone, Māori Purpose zone, ~~and~~ Treaty Settlement Land Overlay and Kauri Cliffs Golf Living subzone - 5,000 m ² if not in a remnant forest, otherwise 500 m ² in a remnant forest; ii. All other zones - 500 m ² .		Reject
FS28.021	Dr John L Craig		Support	The area of permitted clearance needs to be considerably larger. The current rule is an attempt to restrict clearance of existing indigenous vegetation without considering the past or future actions of the landowner. At Tupou where up to 900ha will be replanted in native ecosystems a figure of up to 5000m ² in any 5 year period could still appear punitive.	Allow	Amend IB-R4 to increase the amount of permitted activity clearance and land disturbance for sites where there is a protection mechanism in place such as under SUB-R6.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S91.008	PF Olsen Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Indigenous vegetation and indigenous vegetation clearance are not defined in the plan. Rule IB-R4 requires anyone wishing to undertake any indigenous vegetation in any zone to engage an ecologist to determine if the indigenous vegetation to be cleared is a Significant Natural Area for any clearance greater than 100 m2 (that is any area of 10 x 10 metres). An overgrown residential garden could trigger this rule. The section 32 analysis explores the rationale for not mapping and including SNA maps in the Plan. The approach was to provide a process where SNAs can be identified, assessed and managed using indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds and resource consent processes. The rhetoric in the S32 presents an unattractive proposition for land managers required to obtain resource consent. The requirement for individuals to obtain the ecological assessment for SNAs places a costly burden on resource consent applicants (essentially requiring private individuals to provide and fund public good) and will result in significant delays in obtaining consent as there is a lack of suitably qualified and experienced ecologists available at any time to do this work.	Delete Rule IB-R4 or amend it to not require consent holders to obtain an ecologists report to prove that the indigenous vegetation is not a SNA; and Council undertake ground truth potential SNA's and after appropriate consultation with affected landowners and land managers, introduce the agreed and mapped SNAs into the plan by way of plan change.		Accept in part
FS548.019	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	Federated Farmers is of the view is that it is inappropriate to place the burden of proving that vegetation outside of an identified Significant Natural Area does not meet the relevant on the landowner. Council has obligations under the relevant resource ,management legislation to have done this.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS566.097	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
S168.031	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are	Delete Rule IB-R4		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. In addition, the rule includes the requirement that "a report has been obtained from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area and it is submitted to Council 14 days in advance of the clearance being undertaken". This requirement lacks precision necessary for a permitted activity, and imposes an unfair cost and burden on landowners to identify SNA areas. The rule is unfairly structured such that the areas are assumed SNA unless proven otherwise by landowners and, as such, does not satisfy of section 32 of the RMA 1991.			
FS548.063	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers is of the view that it is inappropriate to place the burden of proving that vegetation outside of an identified Significant Natural Area does not meet the relevant criteria on the landowner. Council has obligations under the relevant resource management legislation to have done this with sufficient accuracy.	Not stated		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S146.007	Trevor John Ashford	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	Amend to: - Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS393.008	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of the Further Submitters land is not a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.007	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 146 and in recognition that part of our land is in part within a SNA.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S451.009	Pacific Eco-Logic	IB-R4	Support in part	The existing rule is confusing and may provide little practical protection for areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna outside the coastal environment. Schedule 4 (Significant Natural Areas) is currently empty. There seems to be no real incentive for landowners to ask for areas of their land to be included within that schedule. Therefore, clearer district plan rules for indigenous vegetation clearance are needed. Using the existing definition of the remnant forest, it is unlikely that such vegetation would be non-significant unless the area is	Amend rule IB-R4 to clarify that consent is required for the clearance of indigenous vegetation covering more than 100m ² per site per calendar year for areas outside the coastal environment (as in PER-2 of Rule IB-R4). If a report from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist certifies that the vegetation or habitat is not significant, then the calendar year permitted clearance limits could be increased. Any remnant forest should be protected from clearance or subject to the clearance allowance for areas that meet the criteria for significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				very small and/or significantly damaged and/or surrounded by a larger area of young vegetation			
FS332.196	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
FS570.1514	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
FS566.1528	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
FS569.1550	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
S250.009	Willowridge Developments Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	It is considered that the provisions as notified are overly onerous as they require an assessment of all areas of indigenous vegetation to be undertaken to determine whether compliance with the permitted activity thresholds. The provisions need to be reconsidered, with appropriate indigenous vegetation clearance thresholds proposed to allow plan users and decision-makers to easily determine compliance.	Amend IB-R4 to include maximum clearance thresholds.		Accept in part
FS332.260	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	The SNA rules and environmental protections in the proposed district plan are entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
FS570.695	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
FS566.709	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.731	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
S364.047	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-R4	Support in part	Rule IB-R4 in its current format does not appear to allow Council discretion to review the ecologist reports and request further information or formally list SNAs in Schedule 4 if it's clear the indigenous vegetation meets the definition of a SNA. The Director-General requests the rule be amended to ensure indigenous vegetation that meets the criteria for being a SNA is suitably protected.	Amend Rule IB-R4 to require resource consent as a controlled activity to enable greater Council oversight of the ecologist's report. Delete PER-2 of Rule IB-R4.		Accept in part
FS354.117	Horticulture New Zealand		Oppose	The submitter seeks to make the rule a controlled activity rule. This would be an overly restrictive regime at considerable cost to landowners.	Disallow	Disallow S364.047	Accept in part
FS570.1128	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
FS346.187	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
FS566.1142	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
FS569.1164	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
S243.033	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs	Delete Rule IB-R4		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.			
FS570.591	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
FS566.605	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
FS569.627	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.124	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	Rules IB-R3 and IB-R4 allow clearance of indigenous vegetation up to 100m2 per calendar year in areas confirmed (by ecological assessment) to be SNAs and in areas where a report has not been obtained. The cumulative effect of this rule, over time, would allow significant amounts of indigenous vegetation to be eliminated. In areas that are considered not to meet the criteria for a SNA, rule IB-R4 allows clearance of 500m2 in most zones, and up to 5,000m2 clearance of indigenous vegetation in rural production and horticulture zone if not in a remnant forest	Amend rule IB-R4		Accept in part
FS570.2012	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2026	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2048	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.128	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	IB-R4	Support in part	The PDP provisions do not address some on-going practical problems with vegetation clearance, which often involved heavy machinery. For example, local conservation groups have experienced cases in recent years where landowners claim they are only or primarily clearing exotic vegetation, even when the destruction of a significant amount of indigenous vegetation is clearly visible on the site. To address this problem, PDP rules on clearance need to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation. The clearance of any type of vegetation, including plantation forests, can cause problems in areas where at-risk species are present. Local conservation groups have found that substantial areas of exotic or mixed vegetation have been cleared by large diggers or bulldozers without any precautions or regard for vulnerable types of indigenous species that are present or nesting on the ground or in the vegetation (eg. nesting kiwis, rare native lizards).	Amend rule IB-R4 to apply to vegetation that includes indigenous vegetation.		Reject
FS570.2016	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2030	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2052	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S542.014	Marianna Fenn	IB-R4	Oppose	Remnant Forests should qualify as SNAs under the broad RPS definition and should be protected. The extent of clearance allowed as a permitted activity is excessive. Allowable clearance will add up to very large areas where land is held in multiple titles and over longer time periods.	Amend to clarify whether this restriction on the area that can be cleared includes or is in addition to permitted clearance of regenerating vegetation under IB-R1- PER1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Justifiable reasons for clearance could be provided by clearly defined exceptions.			
FS570.2142	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
FS346.877	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2156	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
FS569.2178	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
S542.015	Marianna Fenn	IB-R4	Oppose	Clearance of up to 100m2 in a potential SNA will result in incremental loss and degradation.	Amend (2) to limit clearance of up to 50m2 every 5 years.		Accept in part
FS570.2143	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
FS346.878	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.2157	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
FS569.2179	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
S442.153	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R4	Support in part	The existing rule is confusing and may provide little practical protection for areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna outside the coastal environment. Schedule 4 (Significant Natural Areas) is currently empty. There seems to be no real incentive for landowners to ask for areas of their land to be included within that schedule. Therefore, clearer district plan rules for indigenous vegetation clearance are needed.	Amend rule IB-R4 to clarify that consent is required for the clearance of indigenous vegetation covering more than 100m ² per site per calendar year for areas outside the coastal environment (as in PER-2 of Rule IB-R4). If a report from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist certifies that the vegetation or habitat is not significant, then the calendar year permitted clearance limits could be increased. Any remnant forest should be protected from clearance or subject to the clearance allowance for areas that meet the criteria for significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna.		Accept in part
FS346.764	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
S442.184	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	Remnant Forests should qualify as SNAs under the broad RPS definition and should be protected. The extent of clearance allowed as a permitted activity is excessive. Allowable clearance will add up to very large areas where land is held in multiple titles and over longer time periods. Justifiable reasons for clearance could be provided by clearly defined exceptions.	Amend to clarify whether this restriction on the area that can be cleared includes or is in addition to permitted clearance of regenerating vegetation under IB-R1- PER1.		Accept in part
FS346.795	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
S442.185	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R4	Oppose	Clearance of up to 100m ² in a potential SNA will result in incremental loss and degradation.	Amend PER(2) to limit clearance of up to 50m ² every 5 years.		Accept in part
FS346.796	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.	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.			Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S569.007	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP.		Accept in part
FS348.238	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
S167.024	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied. The rule lacks precision necessary for a permitted activity and imposes an unfair cost and burden on landowners to identify SNA areas. The rule is unfairly structured such that the areas are assumed SNA unless proven otherwise by landowners and, as such, does not satisfy the	Delete Rule IB-R4		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				requirements of section 32 of the RMA 1991.			
FS566.386	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
S464.007	LJ King Ltd	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP.	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners - Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land - If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. - Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		Accept in part
FS566.1552	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S527.008	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	IB-R4	Oppose	In areas that are considered not to meet the criteria for a SNA, rule IB-R4 allows clearance of 500m2 in most zones, and up to 5,000m2 clearance of indigenous vegetation in rural production and horticulture zone if not in a remnant forest.	Amend to make IB-R4 mor restrictive (inferred)		Accept in part
FS566.1870	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S543.007	LJ King Limited	IB-R4	Oppose	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite this clear opposition to the concept, the above provisions have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowner to	- Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNAs in the District, instead of forcing them to do this, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing - Given that the council is required to undertake mapping and identification of		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is NOT an SNA. Despite policy IB-P6(a,) which recommends Council's consideration of "assisting landowners with physical assessments by suitably qualified ecologists to determine whether an area is a SNA", any financial assistance will still be at ratepayer's expense, having already footed the bill for the original SNA mapping. In fact, none of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP	SNAs under the NPS-IB, approach should be modified to work in partnership with landowners • Provide incentives (support and resources), not disincentives, for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land • If owners wish to protect their bush, the option of a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice should be available, not just Reserves Act and QEII covenants. • Make SNA mapping available publicly, even if it is not part of the PDP		
FS566.2168	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.024	P S Yates Family Trust	IB-R5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being	Delete Rule IB-R5		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consistently applied.		
S168.032	Setar Thirty Six Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R5	Accept
S187.025	The Shooting Box Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or	Delete Rule IB-R5	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.		
S222.032	Wendover Two Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied	Delete Rule IB-R5	Accept
S148.021	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Makes plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities within an SNA a discretionary activity. This is potentially onerous especially as the SNA criteria established in the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity could see plantation forests captured within the definition of an SNA. As noted above, this rule also fails to provide for plantation forestry activity around the indigenous vegetation that will grow in the	Amend IB-R5 to only apply to the clearance of indigenous vegetation within a scheduled SNA within a plantation forest as a discretionary activity that does not meet the requirements of regulation 93 of the NES-PF.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				riparian and other setbacks that forest owners are required to establish. The NES-PF already provides a permitted activity regime for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities and Council has not provided any justification for a higher standard, as required under section 32(4) of the RMA, nor the need to ignore its own Policy (IB-P5)			
FS85.18	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission to amend the rule IB-R5 to be consistent with the NES-PF.	Allow		Reject
FS196.40	Joe Carr		Support	same reasoning as the submitter	Allow		Reject
FS346.527	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
FS566.133	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
S160.018	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	IB-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule IB-R5 and considers the discretionary activity status to be onerous and unnecessary. The lack of mapping of SNAs and the reliance of interpreting the definition or the use of a qualified expert is onerous and provides no certainty to the landowner.	Delete rule IB-R5 (implied) and Council needs to work with the industry to establish SNA boundaries. Understory, unused tracks/roads, set back areas, riparian zones all need to be managed differently to ensure plantation forestry activities can occur.		Accept
FS85.19	PF Olsen Ltd		Support in part	PF Olsen prefers the amendment of the current rule to be consistent with the NES-PF standards already in place, as per example, regulation 93.	Allow in part		Reject
FS346.588	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)	Disallow	Disallow 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.			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.			
DOC	Marianna Fenn	IB-R5	Oppose	Plantation forestry within an SNA should be a non-complying activity.	Amend to non-complying activity status		Reject
FS85.20	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	To make plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities a non-compliance activity is unnecessarily restrictive and it is inconsistent with provisions for SNA's in the National Environmental Standards from Plantation Forestry.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.2144	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
FS346.879	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 than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.2158	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
FS569.2180	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
S559.018	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	IB-R5	Oppose	Biodiversity and its continued protection are important to Ngāti Rēhia. Our whakapapa connects us to all our native fauna and flora. It is our kaitiaki responsibility to listen to our native fauna and flora and be their voice. Māori land is usually undeveloped land, historically we were not provided the same ability to lend, receive subsidies, or grants to allow us to develop at the same way as non-Māori. This has left Māori as owners of majority of the large parcels of land that have high biodiversity values in	Delete IB-R5 and redraft with tangata whenua (inferred).		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the Far North outside of the Crown owned conversation blocks. Policy and rules should not impact our ability utilise our whenua in a way that will help us to provide social, cultural and economic prosperity for our people. The current approach to provisions is not considered to meet s6(e) of the RMA.			
FS151.326	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS23.264	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	It is important that a balance of use and protection is enabled on Māori land	Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.2208	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
FS348.045	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
FS566.2222	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
FS569.2244	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
S364.048	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	IB-R5	Support in part	To ensure consistency with the relief sought under proposed Rule IB-R3, Rule IB-R5 should be a non-complying activity.	Amend Rule IB-R5 to a non-complying activity status.		Reject
FS225.4	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	To ensure consistency with the relief sought for IB-R3 by the DG Conservation.	Allow		Reject
FS548.097	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter is considered to be onerous and unnecessary.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1129	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
FS346.188	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
FS566.1143	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
FS569.1165	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
S511.070	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	IB-R5	Oppose	Plantation forestry within an SNA should be a non-complying activity.	Amend IB- R5 to non-complying activity status		Reject
FS164.070	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
FS570.1641	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
FS566.1655	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
FS569.1677	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
S243.034	Matauri Trustee Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Amendments to the overview section, and the objectives, policies and rules are sought to: 1. Recognise that the Council has not identified Significant Natural Areas in the Proposed Plan; and 2. Clarify that the role of identifying SNAs cannot be passed onto landowners; however areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna may be desirably protected through the consent process. Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.	Delete Rule IB-R5		Accept
FS570.592	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
FS566.606	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
FS569.628	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
S442.089	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R5	Oppose	Plantation forestry within an SNA should be a non-complying activity.	Amend IB-R5 to non-complying activity status.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.700	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
S442.186	Kapiro Conservation Trust	IB-R5	Oppose	Plantation forestry within an SNA should be a non-complying activity.	Amend to non-complying activity status.		Reject
FS346.797	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
S91.007	PF Olsen Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	The rule is too wide given the definition of plantation forestry activities and also in terms of how a Significant Natural Area is considered in the exposure draft of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. To make plantation forestry and plantation forestry activities a discretionary activity is unnecessarily restrictive and does not recognise the provisions for SNA's in the National Environmental Standards from Plantation Forestry. The rule does not support the policy intent, especially clause b of IB-P5. No justification for the plantation forestry rule has been presented. Just because regulation 6 of the NES-PF enables this, that in itself is not justification.	Delete rule IB-R5 and/or reconsider the need for it in terms of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (e.g. if the clearance of indigenous vegetation meets the thresholds in the NES-PF, then it should be a permitted activity).		Accept
FS566.096	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
S167.025	Bentzen Farm Limited	IB-R5	Oppose	Without the SNA areas being mapped, the section 32 analysis cannot properly conclude that the associated objectives, policies and rules are most appropriate or	Delete Rule IB-R5		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				efficient or effective methods to protect such areas. Without mapping the SNAs, the associated rules lack precision, and in relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as proposed, risk not being consistently applied.			
FS566.387	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
S357.033	Sean Frieling	SUB-O2	Oppose	Despite clear opposition to SNA mapping, provisions in the PDP have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowners to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA. None of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. Overall rural landowners have of their own volition increased not decreased the areas of SNA. Council is now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to restore wetlands, waterways and bush areas. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA in the District, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. Modify the approach to mapping and identification of SNA in accordance with the draft NPS for indigenous biodiversity. Insert incentives, not disincentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land. Amend the options for bush protection. Make SNA mapping available to the public.		Accept in part
S49.004	Paul O'Connor	SUB-O2	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps from the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging and ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.	Amend to provide a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice, instead of just the Reserves Act and QE1II covenants		Reject
S357.035	Sean Frieling	SUB-P8	Oppose	Despite clear opposition to SNA mapping, provisions in the PDP have retained the essence of the SNA mapping, but with the added expense to landowners to have to engage an ecologist to prove that the bush on their property is not an SNA. None of the methods in policy IB-P6 have been given effect under the PDP. Overall rural landowners have of their own	Acknowledge that ratepayers have managed to enhance the SNA in the District, facilitate and assist them in what they are already doing. Modify the approach to mapping and identification of SNA in accordance with the draft NPS for indigenous biodiversity. Insert incentives, not disincentives for landowners to enhance the natural biodiversity of their land.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				volition increased not decreased the areas of SNA. Council is now creating rules in relation to these areas that create a disincentive for landowners to restore wetlands, waterways and bush areas. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural production zone for any subdivision that provides protection of indigenous vegetation.	Amend the options for bush protection. Make SNA mapping available to the public.		
S49.005	Paul O'Connor	SUB-P8	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps from the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging and ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.	Amend to Provide a simple bush protection covenant by consent notice, instead of just the Reserves Act and QE1II covenants		Reject
FS24.49	Lynley Newport		Support	agree means of protection can be simpler than only being able to utilise QEII or reserves act instruments	Allow		Reject
S442.007	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	PDP subdivision policy SUB-P4 refers to 'manage' subdivision as detailed in the district-wide natural environment values, but there are very few rules that put any effective environmental protection policies into effect. Those do not take account of the need to, at least, maintain indigenous biodiversity or ecosystems.	Amend to require consent conditions for fencing on the boundaries of public land, such as esplanade reserve, and around areas of wetlands and waterways. Consent conditions for areas of significant vegetation/habitat etc. should set high standards of protection for indigenous vegetation, kiwi, at risk/threatened species and biodiversity, including appropriate types of fencing, predator control, protection and restoration of native vegetation, weed control, restrictions on planting exotic vegetation, etc. Covenants should be legally binding in perpetuity and should include provisions for monitoring implementation and enforcement.		Accept in part
FS404.068	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	The relief seeks to achieve the purpose of the Act and is consistent with the intent of the D-G's primary submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1703	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS346.618	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.	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.			Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS569.1730	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S254.002	Heather Golley	SUB-R3	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna, significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.1	Stephanie Lane		Support	The submitter is correct. The human cost from all this banning, let alone the cost to dogs and cats, is too high. The full information is not available and leaves too much that can be slipped in surreptitiously.	Allow		Accept in part
FS88.16	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS88.35	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S77.007	Strand Homes Ltd/Okahu Developments Ltd	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
S146.008	Trevor John Ashford	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
S40.008	Martin John Yuretech	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one landowner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
S41.008	Joel Vieviorka	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
S163.011	Julianne Sally Bainbridge	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
S377.008	Rua Hatu Trust	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S410.008	Kerry-Anne Smith	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S411.008	Roger Myles Smith	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S470.008	Helmut Friedrich Paul Letz and Angelika Eveline Letz	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S161.007	Shanon Garton	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S333.052	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary / noncomplying activity	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept
S519.006	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R17	Oppose	The provision does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17.	Accept
S168.060	Setar Thirty Six Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary / noncomplying activity.	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept
S187.052	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary /	Delete Rule SUB-R17.	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				noncomplying activity.		
S348.006	Sapphire Surveyors Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete Rule SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S358.040	Leah Frieling	SUB-R17	Oppose	Delete Rule SUB-R17 as this does not protect significant natural areas.	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept
S357.037	Sean Frieling	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one landowner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S472.045	Michael Foy	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one landowner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S547.008	LJ King Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S544.008	Kelvin Richard Horsford	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs	Accept
S222.053	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary / noncomplying activity.	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept
S463.049	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	This rule appears intended to address the subdivision of SNAs. WBF concurs that such proposals warrant a rigorous consenting regime. However, the reason for this rule placing greater value on SNAs in the coastal	Amend Rule SUB-R17 to reserve non-complying activity status for subdivisions that actually divide an SNA. Remove the activity status distinction based on location in the coastal environment for subdivisions that include (but do not divide) SNAs.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				environment (non-complying status), than on SNAs outside the coastal environment is unclear. WBF considers that a more appropriate approach would be to apply a non-complying consenting pathway to proposals to subdivide SNAs. A discretionary pathway for subdivisions that include, but do not divide, SNAs, whether or not in the coastal environment, is more appropriate. Such subdivisions may have positive effects for SNAs depending on the context. Therefore a "blanket" non-complying setting is, in WBF's view, not an appropriate default position.		
S439.008	John Joseph and Jacqueline Elizabeth Matthews	SUB-R17	Oppose	Rule SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept
S69.006	Robyn Josephine Baker	SUB-R17	Oppose	It is totally unacceptable for FNDC to essentially 'take' land without market rate compensation. These rules appear to have the same effect as the previously tabled SNA proposals which were supposedly discarded when the ratepayers made their feelings very clear to the government. We have purchased this land and worked hard to clear it of noxious vegetation this includes, at our own expense and physical effort, removing gorse, tobacco weed, Australian Sedge and Ragwort. It is completely unreasonable that we should have to pay an ecologist to prove that our small amount of regenerated 'Native Bush' is not an SNA. Given that our Title already includes covenanted land that we are protecting - as is the case for most land owners in the area. We believe that FNDC should not be legally allowed to commandeer any further land by underhand means as is proposed. That these policies are being forced down from 'the top', where 'the top' exists outside	Delete Rule SUB-R17	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of NZ, makes a complete mockery of NZ as a supposed democracy.			
S541.008	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs.		Accept
FS155.70	Fiona King		Support	don't like the thought of "commandeer them". sounds like dictatorship or land theft	Allow		Accept
S485.006	Elbury Holdings	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
FS155.71	Fiona King		Support	no commandeering of land. that is land theft. and fndc is poor at maintaining (weed control etc) any reserves or land it takes. they do not help with SNA lands either - fencing, weed and pest control.	Allow		Accept
S287.009	Tristan Simpkin	SUB-R17	Oppose	This rule does not protect SNAs. This is not incentivising people to plant trees and create wetlands, because of the control over that area once it's matured. Far North residents will be better off to not plant anything. This therefore is a loss of property and property rights.	Delete SUB-R17		Accept
FS29.17	Trent Simpkin		Support	Agree with deleting this rule, it is preventing landowners from planting out areas because as soon as they do they lose control over it. Better to have it as grass.	Allow		Reject
FS570.880	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
FS566.894	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
FS569.916	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S206.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	SUB-R17	Oppose	See no reason why a subdivision should become non-complying simply because the scheduled SNA is to be divided. If the appropriate legal protection can be maintained over more than one allotment, what is the issue? It is possible to subdivide QEII covenanted land with the permission of QEII, and land subject to a Conservation Covenant can also be subdivided subject to the agreement of the parties. There is no reason to retain DIS-2 of Rule SUB-R17.	Delete DIS-2 of Rule SUB-R17		Accept in part
FS172.262	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept in part
FS332.222	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of SNA should be non-complying to avoid fragmentation of ecological units.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept in part
S114.001	Lynley Newport	SUB-R17	Oppose	There is no reason why a subdivision should become non complying simply because the scheduled SNA is to be divided. There is no issue if the appropriate legal protection can be maintained over more than one allotment. It is possible to subdivide QEII covenanted land with the permission of QEII, and land subject to a Conservation Covenant can also be subdivided subject to the agreement of the parties. There is no reason to retain DIS-2.	Delete DIS-2 from SUB-R17.		Accept
FS196.67	Joe Carr		Support	as per the submitter's reasons	Allow		Accept
S395.008	Sean Jozef Vercammen	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
FS196.93	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept
S364.057	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R17	Oppose	Rule SUB-R17 requires the subdivision of a site containing a scheduled SNA to be considered as a discretionary activity. The Director-General is supportive of this activity status, however, is concerned with the effectiveness of the subdivision chapter in relation to SNA sites given there are no	Insert more stringent controls to allow for the consideration and scheduling of SNAs in the subdivision chapter.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNAs currently listed under Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The subdivision chapter does not appear to take into account the subdivision of a site with a potential SNA that is not yet scheduled. The Director-General submits that this could lead to potential SNA sites being subdivided with no ability to consider the adverse effects on the SNA at subdivision stage.			
FS225.7	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	This rule pre-supposes that there are identified SNAs, whereas the current plan does not include any. Additional provisions are needed to address/provide for SNAs that have not been identified in the District Plan.	Allow		Reject
FS548.115	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The relief sought will not add clarity to the Proposed District Plan and will make the subdivision overtly onerous and difficult.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS243.088	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora agree that the PDP should identify and map SNAs and include related objectives, policies, and rules for their protection rather than inserting provisions within the subdivision chapter which would lead to unclear and uncertain approaches on a site-by-site basis. SNAs should be mapped and identified in the PDP. Kāinga Ora opposes any inclusion or provision for non-scheduled features in a PDP	Disallow	Insert more stringent controls to allow for the consideration and scheduling of SNAs in the subdivision chapter	Accept
FS570.1138	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
FS346.197	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1152	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
FS569.1174	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
S364.058	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R17	Oppose	Rule SUB-R17 requires the subdivision of a site containing a scheduled SNA to be considered as a discretionary activity. The Director-General is supportive of this activity status, however, is concerned with the effectiveness of the subdivision chapter in relation to SNA sites given there are no SNAs currently listed under Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The subdivision chapter does not appear to take into account the subdivision of a site with a potential SNA that is not yet scheduled. The Director-General submits that this could lead to potential SNA sites being subdivided with no ability to consider the adverse effects on the SNA at subdivision stage.	Review all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules and add matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity where not already identified. Alternatively, and preferably, formally include sites that meet SNA criteria under Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan.		Reject
FS225.8	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	This rule pre-supposes that there are identified SNAs, whereas the current plan does not include any. Additional provisions are needed to address/provide for SNAs that have not been identified in the District Plan.	Allow		Reject
FS548.116	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The relief sought will not add clarity to the Proposed District Plan and will make the subdivision overtly onerous and difficult.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS243.089	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora agree that the PDP should identify and map SNAs and include related objectives, policies, and rules for their protection rather than inserting provisions within the subdivision chapter which would lead to unclear and uncertain approaches on a site-by-site basis. SNAs should be mapped and identified in the PDP. Kāinga	Disallow	Review all restricted discretionary activity and controlled activity rules and add matters of discretion/control for indigenous biodiversity where not already identified. Alternatively, and preferably, formally include sites that meet SNA criteria under Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Ora opposes any inclusion or provision for non-scheduled features in a PDP.			
FS570.1139	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
FS346.198	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
FS566.1153	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
FS569.1175	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
S511.086	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	SUB-R17	Support in part	SUB-R17 makes subdivision of a scheduled SNA a discretionary activity. However, there are no scheduled SNAs in the Plan and it is unknown when the Plan will schedule any. SUB-R17 should apply to all SNAs not just scheduled SNAs There needs to be an assessment of a property for an SNA prior to any subdivision so the land owner can work out which rules will apply. As drafted the subdivision rules have the potential to carve up SNAs throughout the district and these rules do not give effect Council's responsibilities under the RMA, s6(c) and the RPS.	Amend SUB-R17 so SNAs are protected this may require an assessment before all subdivisions are commenced to determine activity status		Reject
FS23.258	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	There has been no ground truthing of SNAs or the extent of them. The relief would impose restrictions that may not be justified when the characteristics of the particular site are considered.	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS164.086	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.		strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	
FS548.166	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the identification and scheduling of Significant Natural Areas as it provides clarity and certainty for landowners and plan users when making decisions about their land. We oppose the proposed amendment because the requirements are vague and lack clarity. Stating that "SNAs are protected" does not specify how they will actually be protected or what the specific requirements for subdivision will be. Requiring "an assessment" before all subdivisions provides no detail on what type of assessment, the criteria, by who, or any standards that would determine the activity status. This amendment introduces substantial uncertainty for those seeking subdivision consent without outlining the precise expectations or requirements.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1657	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
FS566.1671	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
FS569.1693	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
S511.087	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	SUB-R17	Support in part	Agree subdivision of land containing an SNA should be an SNA. However, the proposed plan does not have any scheduled SNAs. It is unknown when the plan will schedule any SNAs. If SNAs are not mapped then the land owner will need to work out if the land does actually contain an SNA. This condition should be added to all of the	Amend activity: "Subdivision of a site containing a ~~scheduled~~ SNA" if SNAs are not scheduled.		Reject
FS23.259	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Oppose	There has been no ground truthing of SNAs or the extent of them. The relief would impose restrictions that may not be justified when the characteristics of the particular site are considered	Disallow	Disallow the relief sought.	Accept
FS164.087	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
FS548.167	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Plan users rely on scheduling for clarity and certainty when making land use decisions. The proposed amendment will cause confusion and place unnecessary restrictions on land use.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS570.1658	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
FS566.1672	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
FS569.1694	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
S364.056	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R17	Oppose	Rule SUB-R17 requires the subdivision of a site containing a scheduled SNA to be considered as a discretionary activity. The Director-General is supportive of this activity status, however, is concerned with the effectiveness of the subdivision chapter in relation to SNA sites given there are no SNAs currently listed under Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The subdivision chapter does not appear to take into account the subdivision of a site with a potential SNA that is not yet scheduled. The Director-General submits that this could lead to potential SNA sites being subdivided with no ability to consider the adverse effects on the SNA at subdivision stage.	Amend the wording of Rule SUB-R17 to "Subdivision of a site containing a scheduled or qualifying SNA".		Reject
FS548.114	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	The relief sought will not add clarity to the Proposed District Plan and will make the subdivision overtly onerous and difficult.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS243.087	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities		Oppose	Kāinga Ora agree that the PDP should identify and map SNAs and include related objectives, policies, and rules for their protection rather than inserting provisions within the subdivision chapter which would lead to unclear and uncertain approaches on a site-by-site basis. SNAs should be mapped and identified in the PDP. Kāinga Ora opposes any inclusion or provision for non-scheduled features in a PDP	Disallow	Amend the wording of Rule SUBR17 to "Subdivision of a site containing a scheduled or qualifying SNA."	Accept
FS570.1137	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
FS346.196	Royal Forest and Bird		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and	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.			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.			
FS566.1151	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
FS569.1173	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
S502.086	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	SUB-R17	Support in part	Clarification is sought in regard to the Non complying activity status where compliance is not achieved with DIS-1 and DIS-2. Does this mean that if compliance is achieved with either DIS-1 or DIS-2 that activity status is Discretionary.	Amend SUB-R17 to clarify in regard to the Non complying activity status where compliance is not achieved with DIS-1 and DIS-2. Does this mean that if compliance is achieved with either DIS-1 or DIS-2 that activity status is Discretionary.		Reject
FS332.230	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Subdivision of SNA in the coastal area should be non-complying.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept
S167.059	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary / noncomplying activity.	Delete Rule SUB-R17		Accept
FS564.018	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Support the decision sought	Allow	Retain Rule SUB-R7	Accept
FS566.421	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
S243.077	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs in the Proposed Plan. In any event the existence of an SNA on a site should not alter the activity status to full discretionary/noncomplying activity.	Delete Rule SUB-R17		Accept
FS570.635	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.649	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
FS569.671	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
S283.010	Trent Simpkin	SUB-R17	Oppose	This rule does not protect SNAs. This is not incentivising people to plant trees and create wetlands, because of the control over that area once it's matured. Far North residents will be better off to not plant anything. This therefore is a loss of property and property rights.	Delete SUB-R17		Accept
FS570.824	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
FS566.838	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
FS569.860	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
S442.105	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R17	Support in part	SUB-R17 makes subdivision of a scheduled SNA a discretionary activity. However, there are no scheduled SNAs in the Plan and it is unknown when the Plan will schedule any. SUB-R17 should apply to all SNAs not just scheduled SNAs There needs to be an assessment of a property for an SNA prior to any subdivision so the land owner can work out which rules will apply. As drafted the subdivision rules have the potential to carve up SNAs throughout the district and these rules do not give effect Council's responsibilities under the RMA, s6(c) and the RPS.	Amend SUB-R17 so SNAs are protected this may require an assessment before all subdivisions are commenced to determine activity status.		Reject
FS346.716	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S442.106	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SUB-R17	Support in part	Agree subdivision of land containing an SNA should be an SNA. However, the proposed plan does not have any scheduled SNAs. It is unknown when the plan will schedule any SNAs. If SNAs are not mapped then the land owner will need to work out if the land does actually contain an SNA. This condition should be added to all of the .	Amend activity if SNAs not scheduled: Subdivision of a site containing a ~~scheduled~~ SNA.		Reject
FS346.717	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S569.008	Rodney S Gates and Cherie R Gates	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept
FS348.239	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
S464.008	LJ King Ltd	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs.		Accept
FS566.1553	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
S543.008	LJ King Limited	SUB-R17	Oppose	SUB-R17 requires that a subdivision does not divide an SNA. This rule does not protect SNAs but just makes it easier for Council to commandeer them, since they only need to deal with one land owner.	Delete SUB-R17 as this does not protect SNAs		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2169	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
S276.014	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Oppose	Many of the policies set out the intention to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects even through Section 5(2)(c) already requires this. The policies need to set out when, and to what extent, avoiding is the preferred option versus remedying or mitigating and identify what particular effects are being addressed.	Amend policies to set out when, and to what extent, avoiding is the preferred option versus remedying or mitigating and identify what particular effects are being addressed.		Accept in part
FS126.1	Chris Nel		Oppose	I currently reside at 4 Broadview Road within the proposed Dog and Cat ban area. This puts my family in the proposed dog ban zone. Reasons: 1. Property Value; We purchased our family house based off the local tracks and dog walking areas. This largely devalues our property and completely changes the area for my family. 2. No alternative dog area proposed with an already extremely limited area for dogs in the BOI in comparison to other regions in New Zealand. This seems to be a skewed reflection of what the rest of the country is doing and seems to reflect a community group pushing an agenda without consideration of other members of the wider community. 3. Walking; Footpaths are already scarce and one of the only ways to walk to Paihia from Opua is only the coastal walkway. Is there a plan to put foot paths in to connect these areas by road? 4. Why is this proposal targeting densely populated areas and not concentrating on less dense areas? These target zones are going to experience growth, subdivision and development in decades to come. Is	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				this proposal in line with the council plan and is development in this area going to be arrested completely? 5. The kiwi population is growing well without increasing restrictions. Why not focus on those populations first. 6. Where is the plan for better education and training for pet owners and community members on this? Putting in ban zones and without first educating the community is a of resources and will create resistance against nurturing native species. 7. Pests like stoats, rats and mice are currently a much wider problem that is not being discussed. I bank onto native bush and am constantly baiting traps. Are there resources to effectively manage this population or is there a proposal to drop 1080 on the area? 8. SPCA and other animal welfare groups: Are these communities equipped to deal with the reduction is adoption rates. Please consider these non-profit organisations.			
FS127.1	Jamaica Zessner		Oppose	You can't punish the majority for the fault of the minority! By taking away these walking areas, you will create a bigger problem. These walkways are used to exercise dogs and we all know dogs who aren't exercised will create further behavior problems, potentially creating a very stressful relationship between the owner and the dog. Behavioural problem in the dog such as Stress, aggression, irritation and boredom will lead to destructive behaviors. We don't want this! You are then causing more financial stress on the wider community as we will have to DRIVE to an area where we are allowed to walk our dogs - gas prices are VERY	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				HIGH! Not everyone has a backyard to exercise their dog either so we need options and space!			
FS23.088	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.	Accept in part
FS332.182	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
FS570.809	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
FS566.823	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
FS569.845	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
S310.005	Lianne Kennedy	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include Identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.			
FS297.5	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.28	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.5	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.5	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.39	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.904	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
FS566.918	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.940	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
S310.007	Lianne Kennedy	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hiko to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and retain operative policy 13.4.6: 'That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.'		Accept in part
FS297.6	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.29	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.6	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.6	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.40	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS570.906	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
FS566.920	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
FS569.942	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
S309.005	Danielle Hookway	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.32	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.37	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.32	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS257.31	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.32	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S309.007	Danielle Hookway	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hiko to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and retain operative policy 13.4.6: 'That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.'		Accept in part
FS297.33	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.27	Leonie M Exel		Support	SNAs are, for dog owners, just another way to ban our family members from living in Northland.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS100.38	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.33	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.32	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.33	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S311.005	Allen Hookway	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.34	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.39	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.34	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.33	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.34	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S311.007	Allen Hookway	Policies	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan and retain operative policy 13.4.6: 'That any subdivision proposal provides for the protection, restoration and enhancement of heritage resources, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, threatened species, the natural character of the coastal environment and riparian margins, and outstanding landscapes and natural features where appropriate.'		Accept in part
FS297.35	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.40	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.35	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.34	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.35	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.36	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S276.013	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Oppose	Council has reserved the ability to ban cats and dogs in most zones, which we support, however there are several zones where it has not done so, including special zones for Point Veronica, Orongo Bay, Carrington Estate and Kauri Cliffs. Orongo Bay is within the rohe of Russell Landcare Trust and has a high density population of kiwi so there should be an ability to ban cats and dogs in this zone.	Insert policy to ban cats and dogs from 'new subdivisions' in high density kiwi areas (as per the Council's practice note) and from other areas with threatened species where cats and/or dogs are a significant threat (e.g. some shore bird areas).		Reject
FS119.1	Nadine Nel		Oppose	- Kiwis in the point Veronica area have been expanding for many years, there is no need to ban dogs - There are many other kiwi areas such as	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all the islands in the bay of islands, why try and make kiwi specific areas in high residential zones - There are such limited dog walking areas in northland, taking away the opua to te haumi track would severely detract many people from living and visiting here. - Dogs are not the problem! Cats are as they Rome around and hunt at night, as there are no regulations for keeping cats inside - The value and desirability of homes in these areas would be significantly affected			
FS147.1	Mandy Kurien		Oppose	I don't want dogs banned from the Opua Track, there are already so few places to walk dogs in this region, I don't want to lose yet another one. If there are concerns regarding Kiwi birds, the area could be turned into an on leash area.	Disallow		Accept
FS93.46	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- Kiwi are precious and they need our protection. The work that has been done by conservation groups in Northland is extraordinary. - The wellbeing of dog owners is deeply and adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog. - Dog owners - overwhelmingly, research shows - consider their dogs to be a family member. - Figures we obtained from DOC, for the period 1990 - early 2018, showed 4 kiwi had definitely been killed by dogs on the Russell Peninsula. They suspected an additional 3 were killed by dogs but this was not confirmed. - There has been no consultation with iwi or hapu in relation to the specified areas. - Māori households are significantly more likely than other ethnicities to share their home or property with a dog (46%) and this continues to rise. The policy of banning and restricting dog owners from being able to live with their whanau members in Northland thus	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				disproportionately affects the Māori community. This should be reviewed for potential - even if inadvertent - systemic racism. • Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions. • Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland allow dogs. Yet Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC's scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis. • There is no evidence that the dog bans/restrictions in Northland have worked. • These bans/restrictions are so widespread that they are ignored by responsible dog owners, who keep their dogs under control. They pose minimal risk to kiwi or other wildlife. • Owners who let their dogs wander do not obey the Dog Control Act (1996) and they - not landowners, and not dogs - should be the focus of increased control, using that very Act. • Use evidence-driven methods to reduce wandering dog populations. The dog loving community is likely to support these strongly. • The methods known to reduce wandering dogs best are - de-sex dogs, educate the community, and effectively police the owners of wandering dogs. • When kiwi are killed by dogs, they are most often dogs who are wandering without their owners being 'in control' of them at the time. • These dog and cat bans and restrictions have been going for over two decades, and yet this month multiple kiwi have been killed in Opua forest by just two 'wandering dogs.' The dog bans don't work! • FNDC is responsible for educating dog owners about responsible dog ownership, and police owners who let their dogs wander. These two factors -			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				education and effective policing - along with de-sexing dogs across the district, are the most effective solutions to reducing wandering dogs. - Stop using sub-division consents and covenants to ban dogs and cats across New Zealand. Once the community becomes aware of how land has been banned or restricted to pets in Northland, there will be an outcry. - In 2006, DOC funded research on the efficacy of their kiwi aversion training. It was found to be ineffective (Jones, B. M. (2006) "Assessing the effectiveness of a Department of Conservation procedure for training domestic dogs to avoid kiwi"). In that paper, it clearly states that dog bans/prohibitions are likely to be counter-productive (p6): "Given the threat that dogs pose to kiwi, measures to keep dogs out of kiwi habitats seem to be justified and necessary for the protection of kiwi. However, James (2000) argues that the prohibition of dogs from those habitats may impact negatively on kiwi conservation if an authority's approach is perceived by dog owners as rigid or inconsistent. In addition, such measures are often impractical for a number of reasons. First, kiwi frequently inhabit privately owned land, or protected areas that are immediately adjacent to either private land, or public areas where dogs are permitted. Some overlap of the habitats of kiwi and dogs is, therefore, probably unavoidable. Second, dogs have proven to be extremely useful for hunting feral pigs (<i>Sus scrofa</i>), deer (<i>Cervus spp.</i>) and goats (<i>Capra hircus</i>) and measures to control these populations undoubtedly also benefit kiwi. Third, given the geography of most kiwi habitats, enforcing dog restrictions is likely to be extremely difficult, especially in rural areas where recreational hunting is popular." - Beginning in 2021, we polled our			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				members: "In your view, if you move into, or live in, a town or zone where there are many weka or kiwi present, whether or not they were always there or have been actively released there, what rules or restrictions should there be in relation to dogs?" The top responses (of 646 votes) give an indication of the kinds of restrictions that dog owners may consider acceptable in sensitive areas: • 19% - Fencing required • 17% - Dogs must be registered and micro-chipped • 11% - More frequent checks by dog control officers in such areas • 11% - Don't release ground dwelling endangered birds in or near urban areas. • 9% - Require dogs to be neutered or spayed • 7% - Dogs must be indoors at night Please! Allow our community to unite: • STOP the dog bans • INCREASE de-sexing • INCREASE animal management coverage in specific areas • INCREASE community education			
FS88.53	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	I oppose banning of cats and dogs. There are better ways to protect kiwi without impinging on rate payers' and landowners' rights, and those of renters.	Disallow		Accept
FS123.1	Melita McMaster		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
FS168.1	Julie Bennett		Oppose	These animals are part of our families, and it is ridiculous to ban them due to a bad owner here and there who doesn't follow the rules. In addition, lumping cats and dogs together under one ban is not logical or rational. Dogs can easily be put on a lead, watched and controlled to protect our	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				kiwi without banning them, whereas cats are much harder to keep track of or contain when outdoors.			
FS23.087	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	Accept
FS398.004	Waitoto Developments Limited		Oppose	The matters sought are already carried out in relation to subdivision within Kiwi High Density areas. No further policies are required.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS332.181	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
FS570.808	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
FS566.822	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
FS569.844	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
FS149.1	Michaela Radenkovic		Oppose	I'm a responsible dog owner and my dogs are bird trained. I have yet to meet a fellow dog owner on the tracks and beach that are chasing birds and I keep my pets under control. It's their home too	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S276.011	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Oppose	Policies should: - Recognise that SNAs are dynamic and knowledge is not complete. - There are sites that meet the SNA criteria that are not mapped - There are important indigenous biodiversity values that are not in mapped SNAs (e.g. high density kiwi areas) - The integrity of SNAs is affected by lot sizes, with subdivision resulting in SNAs becoming fragmented both in terms of management and tenure, and incremental habitat loss to allow for access ways and buildings.	Insert policies that: - Recognise that SNAs are dynamic and knowledge is not complete. - There are sites that meet the SNA criteria that are not mapped - There are important indigenous biodiversity values that are not in mapped SNAs (e.g. high density kiwi areas) - The integrity of SNAs is affected by lot sizes, with subdivision resulting in SNAs becoming fragmented both in terms of management and tenure, and incremental habitat loss to allow for access ways and buildings.		Accept in part
FS23.084	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.	Accept in part
FS23.085	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.	Accept in part
FS332.179	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.806	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
FS566.820	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
FS569.842	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
S276.015	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Oppose	In some cases the most appropriate action is to deny the application. The Auckland Unitary Plan is an example of good policy direction on biodiversity offsetting.	Insert a detailed policy on offsetting or a statement that offsetting is not always the appropriate action.		Accept in part
FS23.089	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.	Accept in part
FS332.183	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
FS570.810	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
FS566.824	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
FS569.846	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
S276.016	Russell Landcare Trust	Policies	Oppose	Insert provision for providing for long-tailed bat protection where an application occurs within areas used by bats. The main issues are protection of actual and potential roost trees and limiting lights at night.	Insert provision for providing for long-tailed bat protection where an application occurs within areas used by bats.		Accept in part
FS23.090	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.	Accept in part
FS332.184	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
FS570.811	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
FS566.825	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
FS569.847	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
S259.024	Nicole Wooster	Rules	Support in part	While we understand and agree that it is important to protect biodiversity, we note that more flexibility on the rules has been given to land within the Māori purpose zone due to a number of reasons. It is hoped that Council where possible will provide for more opportunities for non Māori purpose land that also has a high degree of indigenous vegetation on it to provide for the economic and social wellbeing of those	Amend plan to provide further consideration of rules in relation to the thresholds that trigger the need for consent to ensure that people have reasonable use of their property and are not penalised for retaining large areas of vegetation.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				landowners. This is important for intergenerational properties that may have multiple family interests and need to develop areas that are covered in indigenous vegetation but still retain the overall biodiversity of the site but would have to go through an expensive resource consent process to demonstrate that intent.			
S310.006	Lianne Kennedy	Rules	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hiko to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.7	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.30	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS293.7	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.7	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS256.41	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.905	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
FS566.919	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
FS569.941	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
S309.006	Danielle Hookway	Rules	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hiko to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.36	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS93.52	Leonie M Exel		Support		Disallow		Accept in part
FS100.41	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.36	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.35	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.37	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S311.006	Allen Hookway	Rules	Oppose	Following protests by tangata whenua, farmers and other landowners who said the proposal to identify land as SNAs undermined their sovereignty and property rights, this opposition culminated in a large hikoi to the Council's Kaikohe headquarters where tangata whenua delivered a petition against the process. 'Encouraging landowners to include identified Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4 of the District Plan at the time of subdivision and development' implies this is voluntary when it clearly isn't.	Delete SNAs/wetlands from the District Plan.		Accept in part
FS297.37	Wilson Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS100.42	Allen Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule			
FS293.37	Danielle Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS257.36	Amber Hookway		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
FS256.38	Lianne Kennedy		Support	After consultation with landowners, the FNDC withdrew the SNA maps from the PDP. Despite clear opposition to the concept SNAs have not been dropped at all, only their mapping and listing in a Schedule	Allow		Accept in part
S283.009	Trent Simpkin	Rules	Oppose	Oppose SNA Maps and requirement of Ecologist report. FNDC had originally withdrawn the SNA maps. With this new rule they are being snuck back in, and then also forcing anyone with bush on their property to get an ecologist report (\$\$\$) to prove that its not an SNA. So that tells us that all bush is regarded as an SNA 'unless proved otherwise' - which is a costly activity. This is not incentivising people to plant trees and create wetlands, because of the control over that area once it's matured. Far North residents will be better off to not plant anything. This therefore is a loss of property and property rights.	Amend to allow us to be stewards of our own land and trees and bush we've planted. Remove the requirement for the ecologist report, it's another red tape item which adds to the cost of building and developing, driving the cost of living upwards.		Accept in part
FS45.21	Tristan Simpkin		Support	Support as per Reasons given in submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.823	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
FS566.837	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
FS569.859	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
S259.006	Nicole Wooster	Rules	Support in part	The identification of SNA captures large areas of regeneration manuka and kanuka on the submitter's property. It is unclear how this is significant when in this location manuka and kanuka quickly establishes is land is not actively farmed. The vegetation and surrounding area is not near any DOC estate and due to surrounding areas being mostly clear of vegetation the area is heavily populated with possums and wild pigs. In reality, retaining such vegetation has resulted in significant damage to horticulture crops and paddocks due to pigs and possums. If the vegetation is not providing habitat for significant fauna, then we are unsure why these areas are SNAs as manuka and kanuka grow like weeds and is not at risk. Trimming would also be prevented so you could not even undertake activities to collect oil. Removal and regeneration is best for the industry as best products come from young trees. Due to changes to MPI classification of manuka rated honey, the value has dropped significantly and it is difficult to sell bulk honey as there is a lack of demand.	Amend SNA classification in submitter's location to not include areas of manuka and kanuka that do not contain any significant fauna. Different rules should apply to manuka and kanuka in this type of location due to this. If this is supported, the general vegetation clearancerules should also apply for a reasonable level of clearance allowed as a permitted activity for this type of situation.		Reject
FS172.276	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Reject
FS196.242	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
S259.008	Nicole Wooster	Rules	Support in part	The identification of SNA captures large areas of regeneration manuka and kanuka on the submitter's property. It is unclear how this is significant when in this location manuka and kanuka quickly establishes is land is not actively farmed. The vegetation and surrounding area is not near any DOC	Amend SNA classification in submitter's location to not include areas of manuka and kanuka that do not contain any significant fauna. Different rules should apply to manuka and kanuka in this type of location due to this. If this is supported, the general vegetation clearancerules should also apply for a reasonable		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				estate and due to surrounding areas being mostly clear of vegetation the area is heavily populated with possums and wild pigs. In reality, retaining such vegetation has resulted in significant damage to horticulture crops and paddocks due to pigs and possums. If the vegetation is not providing habitat for significant fauna, then we are unsure why these areas are SNAs as manuka and kanuka grow like weeds and is not at risk. Trimming would also be prevented so you could not even undertake activities to collect oil. Removal and regeneration is best for the industry as best products come from young trees. Due to changes to MPI classification of manuka rated honey, the value has dropped significantly and it is difficult to sell bulk honey as there is a lack of demand.	level of clearance allowed as a permitted activity for this type of situation.		
FS172.278	Audrey Campbell-Frear		Support	For the reasons set out in this primary submission.	Allow		Accept
S276.012	Russell Landcare Trust	Rules	Oppose	In general, the rules tend to be concerned with indigenous vegetation, sometimes indigenous habitat, but threatened species are not explicitly identified in the rules very often.	Insert rules that recognize and protect threatened species (not just indigenous vegetation)		Accept in part
FS23.086	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	Accept in part
FS332.180	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	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
				the historic and special character of Russell and its surrounds.			
Threatened speciesFS57 0.807	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
FS566.821	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
FS569.843	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
S254.006	Heather Golley	Management Plan Subdivision	Oppose	Opposes objectives, sections, policies, rules, regulations, practice notes, and supporting documentation which relates to wellbeing, dog owners, dogs, the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices), the impact of dogs on the environment, kennels, sub-divisions, dogs and their relationship with native flora and fauna, significant natural areas, zoning which limits dog ownership, and dog limits placed on Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). There is no identification of SNA's or the "Kiwi" areas referred to in the provisions, that also makes it impossible to properly understand and assess the impact of the DP on individuals and or the district. Our dogs are our family members, best friends, counsellors, workmates, pig hunters, and brilliant farmhands. Cats are family to many people, especially the elderly. Submitter does not accept that FNDC has a right to ban and restrict her family from owning pets responsibly, anywhere in Northland. FNDC needs to consider the unintended consequences of their actions including but not limited to: - humanitarian and mental health crises with people having to relinquish pets - animal rescue services and pounds being overwhelmed with dogs and cats, financially stressed - fewer children living in homes which have	Amend the provisions of the District Plan so they do not limit dog ownership or result in the banning of dogs and cats (via resource consent conditions, covenants or consent notices) (inferred). Make critical supporting documents, and all other undisclosed relevant information publicly available now, including Draft SNA maps, The 'Practice Note for Significant Indigenous Flora and Fauna', and the 'Bay of Islands Kiwi Distribution Map - Support Document'.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				dogs and cats, which means they will increase their risk of harm from dogs because they will not learn how to care for, respect, and control their dogs. - less positive view of our district as a retirement area.			
FS88.17	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS88.36	Stephanie Lane		Support		Allow		Accept in part
S259.005	Nicole Wooster	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	If mapping is proposed through submission or the government releasing the NPSIB then the draft mapping for the submitter's property should be reviewed and changed as required if in error, it has incorrectly identified SNA areas on the submitter's property. Mapping must be refined to ensure that it is correct due to the level of controls that will apply to land identified in an SNA. There is also concern that the mapping was based on flora only and no consideration for the lack of fauna. Council should continue to fund the mapping exercise for land owners that are not developing their land.	Amend, if proposed, any SNA mapping if brought into the plan, so that the mapping for the submitter's property is fully reviewed by the submitter and corrected to not protect land that is an SNA.		Reject
S63.001	Kellie Edwards	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Opposes changing Rural production land or rural lifestyle block sized properties being changed to SNA. it does not make practical sense for small titles of proposed SNA areas on Wainui Road near Ota Point Road to become SNA. The immediate local area is rural production, lifestyle blocks and sections in an area requiring more housing due to a substantial lack. This has obviously been recognised due to the close proximity of the new subdivision on Ota Point Road. Singling out a couple of small properties to be SNA beside a neighbour who is currently constructing a subdivision seem unreasonable. As stated in your plan the SNA proposal has been desk based and the 192 Wainui Road properties included as proposed SNA's seem lumped in due to this rather than a sensible and realistic assessment that feet on the ground	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that the land at 192 Wainui Road, Kaeo are not 'Significant Natural Areas'.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				at the titles at 192 Wainui Road, Kaeo would provide.		
S546.003	Ian Diarmid Palmer	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	* In consistent with NPS-IB: The Far North SNA Regime is unnecessarily inconsistent with the 'Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity' (NPS-IB; in particular by not distinguishing between Medium and High criteria SNA area, and this causes it to be unreasonably onerous to a large number of landowners in the Far North District. *Contrary to the Need for Active Management: The bigger threat to indigenous biodiversity and healthy ecosystems in the FND is not the lack of area that has native vegetation on it or the deliberate clearing of native vegetation, but rather the impact of pest animals and invasive non-indigenous plants on areas of nature vegetation. * Inaccurate Spatial Definition: The SNA boundaries are defined by aerial imagery acquired between 2014 and 2016 which in many cases will not correctly reflect the state of the land when the PDP is notified (when the relevant rule will take effect), and in any event can't accurately define what land areas do and don't meet the criteria for SNAs. It is apparent that there has been no effective evaluation of the land within the Landowners' Allotments (which are not even located on Butler's Point - the Allotments are on the Rangitoto Peninsula) to validly assess what if any land meets the RPS SNA criteria or the draft NPS-IB criteria (refer to Attachment 1 of the Submission). *Undermines Covenanting Regime: No guarantee has been given that the FNDC will retain its current policy and practices of providing rates relief in return for	Amend PDP to reference the 685 SNAs defined in the preparation of the FN SNA Regime in the same way that the ODP references the Protected Natural Areas (PNA) Programme currently. (Noting that when the Landowners applied for a RC for a boundary adjustment to their Allotments the FNDC had much regard for the particular PNA that related to the Allotments (PNA 004/207) and this was the starting point for reaching agreement on areas to covenant recognising that the PNA wasn't of sufficient resolution or sufficiently up to date to apply without further consideration of the current specifics of the land).	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				landowners voluntarily protecting areas by way of conservation covenants once the land that might otherwise be covenanted has becomes 'protected' under the FN SNA Regime. *Undermines Conditions of Consent Regime: Currently activities that are not Permitted or Controlled are often given RMA Resource Consent (RC) in return for environmental offsets involving the landowner proposing / accepting conditions requiring protection of areas of indigenous bush by subjecting those areas to conservation covenants. *Discourages enhancement of non-SNA land: The FN SNA Regime penalises landowners who in the past have facilitated land reverting to regenerating indigenous bush by subjecting them to restrictive land use rules, whereas landowners who have cleared land and kept it largely clear of native bush are exempt from such penalty. *Rules for SNAs unreasonably restrictive: The rules for land subject to an SNA under the DDP are dramatically more restrictive than the rules in the Operative District Plan (ODP) even for land currently zoned Outstanding Landscape. *Overlay Overload: The proposed SNA overlay in the DDP adds to a plethora of new overlays not seen as necessary in the ODP, each with its own set of rules restricting land use.		
S546.004	Ian Diarmid Palmer	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	* In consistent with NPS-IB: The Far North SNA Regime is unnecessarily inconsistent with the 'Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity' (NPS-IB; in particular by not distinguishing between Medium and High criteria SNA area, and this causes it to be unreasonably onerous to a large number of landowners in the Far	Amend PDP, so when, and if, a landowner submits a RC application that relates to land subject to an SNA where the outcome of the application may be affected if the land in question met the High SNA criteria, then the landowner should have the right to have a detailed assessment of the area concerned undertaken (by consultants of his/her choice but at Council expense) applying the SNA assessment approach and criteria	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				North District. *Contrary to the Need for Active Management: The bigger threat to indigenous biodiversity and healthy ecosystems in the FND is not the lack of area that has native vegetation on it or the deliberate clearing of native vegetation, but rather the impact of pest animals and invasive non-indigenous plants on areas of nature vegetation. * Inaccurate Spatial Definition: The SNA boundaries are defined by aerial imagery acquired between 2014 and 2016 which in many cases will not correctly reflect the state of the land when the PDP is notified (when the relevant rule will take effect), and in any event can't accurately define what land areas do and don't meet the criteria for SNAs. It is apparent that there has been no effective evaluation of the land within the Landowners' Allotments (which are not even located on Butler's Point - the Allotments are on the Rangitoto Peninsula) to validly assess what if any land meets the RPS SNA criteria or the draft NPS-IB criteria (refer to Attachment 1 of the Submission). *Undermines Covenanting Regime: No guarantee has been given that the FNDC will retain its current policy and practices of providing rates relief in return for landowners voluntarily protecting areas by way of conservation covenants once the land that might otherwise be covenanted has become 'protected' under the FN SNA Regime. *Undermines Conditions of Consent Regime: Currently activities that are not Permitted or Controlled are often given RMA Resource Consent (RC) in return for	as set out in the NPS-IB, such that the SNA land in question can accurately and reliably be categorised as High, Medium or Low (where Low means doesn't meet the Medium threshold and hence is excluded from the SNA). By this approach, the FNDC as the Consenting Authority can still have proper regard to information related to the SNA (as revised if appropriate per the prior paragraph) that relates to the land in question when deciding on RC conditions (and such conditions may require some or all of the SNA identified land in question to be subject to a conservation covenant). This is no different in concept to what the FNDC does now under the ODP when it has regard to Protected Natural Areas (PNAs) even though there are no specific PNA overlay or PNA specific set of rules in the ODP.	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				environmental offsets involving the landowner proposing / accepting conditions requiring protection of areas of indigenous bush by subjecting those areas to conservation covenants. *Discourages enhancement of non-SNA land: The FN SNA Regime penalises landowners who in the past have facilitated land reverting to regenerating indigenous bush by subjecting them to restrictive land use rules, whereas landowners who have cleared land and kept it largely clear of native bush are exempt from such penalty. *Rules for SNAs unreasonably restrictive: The rules for land subject to an SNA under the DDP are dramatically more restrictive than the rules in the Operative District Plan (ODP) even for land currently zoned Outstanding Landscape. *Overlay Overload: The proposed SNA overlay in the DDP adds to a plethora of new overlays not seen as necessary in the ODP, each with its own set of rules restricting land use.			
S364.002	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity.	Insert SNAs in the plan using the report prepared for Council titled "Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of the Far North District - Volume 1" prepared by Wildlands Consultants (Contract Report No. 4899d, December 2019) to include SNAs in the Proposed District Plan.		Reject
FS24.64	Lynley Newport		Oppose	If Council was to follow this path it would have to re-notify its entire section on IB and any related provisions elsewhere in the	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				plan. It is simply too large a change to do via a decision on a submission.			
FS93.14	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	- The sub-division chapter is of key concern to Northland's dog owners, of which I am one. - The legal means to control dogs is the clearly-named Dog Control Act (1999). This requires strong community consultation every 5-10 years via bylaw reviews, to ensure that the dog-owning community has a say in such decisions. - To use various clauses in the Resource Management Act (RMA) to control dogs is legally inappropriate. - This consultation on the DP is immensely complicated and cannot be seen as a substitute for consultation with communities about matters which affect their wellbeing. - The wellbeing of dog owners, who comprise between 40-50% of Northland households, is deeply adversely affected by not being able to live with their dog. - Dog owners - overwhelmingly in the research - consider their dogs to be a family member. - Dog owners are increasingly being forced out of Northland by dog bans and restrictions on subdivisions. - Less than 5% of rental properties in Northland allow dogs - Northland Regional Council (NRC) recommends that landlords ban pets in leases. This is outside NRC's scope, and inappropriate in a housing crisis. - There is no evidence to suggest that the 2 decades of dog bans through sub-divisions have led to any reduction in the number of kiwi killed by dogs in Northland, or to the number of wandering dogs in Northland.	Disallow		Accept
FS67.91	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS68.90	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S448.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Schedule 4 is blank, even though the Council's consent process has already protected a number of sites that are SNAs or equivalent. This is a grave omission as the schedule should contain a list of all SNA's and similar sites which have already been protected through the consent process.	Insert SNA's and similar sites that have already been protected through the Council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, into Schedule 4 of the PDP.		Reject
FS67.92	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.91	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S338.044	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS67.93	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.92	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S522.045	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.			
FS67.94	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S430.001	Kapiro Residents Association	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	SNAs and similar sites that have already been protected through the council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, should be added automatically by the council into Schedule 4 of the PDP. The existing protected sites need to be added promptly into Schedule 4 - there is no justification for omitting the existing protected sites.	Amend Schedule 4 Schedule of significant natural areas to include all areas already protected through the resource consent process, updating the Schedule to automatically to include all new protected sites		Reject
FS67.95	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.94	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S529.043	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS67.96	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S421.139	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of proposed Schedule 4 in the proposed district plan. The schedule is an appropriate way to recognise the relationship between private landowners and Council and the need to work in partnership to manage Significant Natural Areas.	Retain Schedule 4 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas and develop as proposed		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS68.93	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S511.125	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	Support having the schedule but the schedule does not have any SNAs listed. This schedule should be filled with SNAs	Amend to fill Schedule with SNAs		Reject
FS68.95	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.93	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS164.125	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
FS570.1696	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
FS566.1710	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
FS569.1732	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
S364.002	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	There are no scheduled SNAs within Schedule 4 of the Proposed District Plan. The Director-General is strongly opposed to this decision, which is considered contrary to section 6(c) of the RMA, the objectives and policies of the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, and the NPSIB exposure draft. The Director-General is concerned that the current wording of the subdivision chapter will allow potential SNA sites to be subdivided with minimal ability to consider the adverse effects of the subdivision on indigenous biodiversity.	Insert SNAs in the plan using the report prepared for Council titled "Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats of the Far North District - Volume 1" prepared by Wildlands Consultants (Contract Report No. 4899d, December 2019) to include SNAs in the Proposed District Plan.		Reject
FS69.88	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS88.74	Stephanie Lane		Oppose	How can we submit on a report that we've never seen or heard of?	Disallow		Accept
FS25.123	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNA requires current mapping based on ground truthing and ecological assessment.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission.	Accept
FS66.167	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS225.12	Pacific Eco-Logic		Support	The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity is now operative. It requires the Council to have completed an assessment and include within the District Plan the location, a map and a description of attributes for all Significant Natural Areas by 2027-28. While consultants have identified and mapped SNAs, community consultation has yet to occur. Given the national requirement and scale of areas identified so far, it would be appropriate for	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the Central Government to assist with this process.			
FS339.034	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support	Area that qualify as significant should be treated as such, whether scheduled or not.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject
FS339.048	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust		Support in part	Areas contained in the Wildlands report should be included as SNA's, however this report is not exhaustive. Identification of SNA's needs to be an iterative process if s 6(c) RMA is to be properly implemented. SNA should be treated as such whether identified or not. SNA identification is not dependent on landholder agreement. Since this submission was made, the NZPSIB has commenced. Resourcing hapū or iwi to identify SNA's will assist in identification of such areas	Allow in part	Amend IB-P1 as follows: " a. using the ecological significance criteria in Appendix 1 National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity; b. including areas that meet the ecological significance criteria as Significant Natural Areas in Schedule 4; c. delete; d. providing assistance to landowners and hapū or iwi to add Significant Natural Areas to Schedule 4 of the District Plan"	Reject
FS548.078	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS548.090	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	It is not considered appropriate for a new raft of provisions to be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan without appropriate consultation occurring.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept
FS325.076	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT supports mapping for SNA's to provide clarity and relative certainty in the Plan so long as these areas are correctly mapped and the mapping is based on current ground truthing and ecological assessment. Mapping should also be cognisant of existing and proposed zoning and the need to achieve the overall strategic direction for the District.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject
FS534.059	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	With the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 ('NPSIB') now operative, a nationally consistent framework applies to the identification and regulation of Significant Natural Areas. While the 2019 Wildlands report may assist the local authorities to implement the	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				NPSIB, WBFL questions whether reliance on the Wildlands report is appropriate given the NPSIB's recent gazettal.			
FS570.1083	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
FS346.142	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
FS566.1097	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
FS569.1119	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
S448.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Schedule 4 is blank, even though the Council's consent process has already protected a number of sites that are SNAs or equivalent. This is a grave omission as the schedule should contain a list of all SNA's and similar sites which have already been protected through the consent process.	Insert SNA's and similar sites that have already been protected through the Council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, into Schedule 4 of the PDP.		Reject
FS69.89	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS275.51	Peter and Donna Brown		Support	The omission of all particulars of SNA's is regrettable and disentitles the territorial authority to take any action pursuant to any SNA.	Allow		Reject
FS66.168	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1885	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1813	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S338.044	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS69.90	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Allow in part		Accept
FS66.169	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.982	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.996	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1018	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S522.045	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS69.91	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.170	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1784	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S430.001	Kapiro Residents Association	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	SNAs and similar sites that have already been protected through the council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, should be added automatically by the council into Schedule 4 of the PDP. The existing protected sites need to be added promptly into Schedule 4 - there is no justification for omitting the existing protected sites.	Amend Schedule 4 Schedule of significant natural areas to include all areas already protected through the resource consent process, updating the Schedule to automatically to include all new protected sites		Reject
FS69.92	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.171	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
S159.050	Horticulture New Zealand	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	There is a requirement in the draft National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity that territorial authorities undertake a district wide assessment: Subpart 2 - Significant natural areas 3.8 Assessing areas that qualify as significant natural areas (1) Every territorial authority must undertake a district-wide assessment of the land in its district to identify areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna that qualify as SNAs.	Amend to reword in line with National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity provisions		Reject
FS151.214	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS349.002	Northland Regional Council		Support	It is appropriate to align the Proposed District Plan with the requirements of the National Policy Statement - Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) now that it has been gazetted.	Allow	allow original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS548.050	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	It is important that existing, legally established activities are recognized and provided for so that they can continue.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Reject
FS346.005	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The Plan should be redrafted to give effect to the NPSIB.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.212	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
FS566.226	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
FS569.248	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
S421.139	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support	Federated Farmers supports the inclusion of proposed Schedule 4 in the proposed district plan. The schedule is an appropriate way to recognise the relationship between private landowners and Council and the need to work in partnership to manage Significant Natural Areas.	Retain Schedule 4 Schedule of Significant Natural Areas and develop as proposed		Reject
FS25.135	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support in part	Supports in principle the need to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas and to give effect to the NPS Indigenous Biodiversity. However, the process needs to ensure landowners affected have a fair and reasonable opportunity to be involved in decisions affecting their land.	Allow in part	Allow original submission in part subject to appropriate wording and mapping.	Reject
FS325.080	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support in part	TT support the inclusion of a Schedule to record Significant Natural Areas subject to ground truthing and ecological assessment to ensure accuracy and ensure the list SNA's contribute to achievement of the strategic direction.	Allow in part	Allow the original submission in part.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1371	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
FS346.373	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
FS566.1385	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
FS569.1407	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S529.043	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS66.172	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The insertion of SNAs in the Plan does not accord with the requirements of the NPS:IB, and if undertaken, should be done by way of a Variation to the Proposed Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.1933	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1947	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1969	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S451.023	Pacific Eco-Logic	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	This schedule is empty, and there are few incentives for it to be used by landowners	Amend to provide additional incentives for this schedule, as raised in submission (refer to S451.017)		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.210	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
FS570.1528	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
FS566.1542	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
FS569.1564	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
S180.001	Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Not Stated	the schedule is blank, even though the Council's Consent process has already protected a number of sites that are SNA or equivalent. this is a grave omission	insert SNAs and similar sites that have already been protected through the Council's resource consent process, as well as future sites, should be added automatically by the Council into Schedule 4		Reject
FS566.007	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.039	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.002	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
S442.144	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	Support having the schedule but the schedule does not have any SNAs listed. This schedule should be filled with SNAs.	Amend to fill this Schedule with SNAs.		Reject
FS346.755	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.167	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Support in part	This schedule is empty, and there are few incentives for it to be used by landowners.	Amend to provide additional incentives for this schedule, as raised in submission (refer to S451.017).		Reject
FS346.778	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
S449.044	Kapiro Conservation Trust	SCHED4 - Schedule of significant natural areas	Oppose	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years however they are not included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend Schedule 4 to include ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc		Reject
FS569.1843	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1860	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S430.003	Kapiro Residents Association	General Residential Zone	Not Stated	Zoning of SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, should be zoned (or automatically rezoned) in a special zoning or overlay for protected SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect ecological values at the site	Insert a new zone or overlay for SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, alternatively assign status similar to a Reserve on private property		Reject
S147.001	J L Hayes and Sons Ltd	Māori Purpose - Rural Zone	Support in part	Providing planning maps is important, but they need to be accurate and provide information for sections of the Plan. Most of the Maps show Rural Production zone when at least half is in native bush and regeneration.	When SNA are discussed, it is important to know what other vegetation is in the area. Maori purpose zones are shown with much Maori land not shown.		Accept in part
S180.004	Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	The blocks current zone is general coastal, and the southern end of the site is Coastal environment. Rural Lifestyle or any other	rezone lot 3 DP 415575 (Kurapari Rd) from rural Lifestyle zone to a special zoning for SNA and similar ecological sites and /or given status similar to a Reserve on private property		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				residential zone is totally inappropriate for a protected SNA site.			
FS566.0010	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.042	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.005	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
S448.004	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose	SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the resource consenting process, and sites that will be added by future consenting, should be zoned in a special zoning or overlay for protected SNAs and similar ecological sites or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect ecological values at the site.	Amend zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575, Kurapari Road, Rangitane from Rural Lifestyle Zone to a special zoning for SNA's or to apply a status similar to a Reserve on private property to the site.		Reject
FS569.1888	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1816	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S164.001	Green Inc Ltd	Rural Production Zone	Oppose	The existing plan despite 1B-05 creates a strong disincentive to restoring indigenous ecosystems as current planning will likely result in those areas becoming SNAs with associated restrictive controls. In contrast, where the land is managed to retain and improve pasture, controls on use are minimal. The vision for Tupou is to retain posture and food and wool production on the flatter better quality soils and return the steep erodible hill country to native ecosystems. These will then be managed as functioning native ecosystems that can generate carbon and biodiversity credits. They will also be used for ecotourism including high end accommodation. Pest animal and weed control is an Integral part of the plan. The native ecosystems planned include forest, wetlands, a lake	amend zoning of Tupou from Rural Production to a new special zone such as managed ecological zone or a special purpose zone for Tupou. Tupou NA11D/1151 NA42C/379 NA55B/383 NA71D/247 NA102A/98 NA102A/99 NA102A/100 NA115C/434 NA136/174 NA136/235 NA140/216 NA262/283 NA315/329 NA340/269 NA357/153 NA245/209		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and ponds, coastal ecosystems including dunes and cliff faces. Some areas would be left open to retain views and fire breaks. Currently the property has 5 putative SNAs although all are severely compromised with pests (pigs, possums, rats, stoats, rabbits) and weeds (especially pampas). The development we plan will turn up to 700+ hectares into high quality and functioning native ecosystems that could all potentially have the values associated with an SNA. My submission is that such endeavors and developments need to be "promoted and enabled" (1B-05) in a way that allows ongoing development. Small areas of clearance, erection of buildings and formation of roads and tracks should be permitted activities as long as the basic justification of "net biodiversity gains" is included. Including people in nature is a clear way to assist nature. The owners have already demonstrated this model under more conventional rules at Tahī (www.tahinz.com). Restrictions on many actions were unreasonable compared with that applied to neighbours who had retained poor quality pasture without weed or pest control. The proposed District Plan has special zones for other major developments such as Corrington and Kauri Cliffs that make provision for specific development needs. Hastings District Council have included a special zone for nature conservation activities (poorly named as Nature Preservation Zone). A more general zone can act as an option toward 1B-05 that can encourage others to act similarly although it is unlikely that other properties will have the breadth of ecosystems found at Tupou or the desire to include ecotourism and accommodation. Also many will not be able to fund the intensive levels of pest control planned for Tupou. A key issue is that the zoning removes the need to classify the area as an SNA with the associated restrictive		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				controls. Clearance to a certain level is a permitted activity for buildings, roads and tracks. Enhancing accommodation offerings is a permitted activity Pest control is a required activity Archaeological and taonga sites for local hapu are not modified. All actions fit under on umbrella of "net biodiversity gain" Other conditions, permissions and requirements will need to be developed but these are best worked through with Council Planners.			
FS112.1	Carly McIlroy		Support	I support this submission. The Proposed Plan would result in large area of the land potentially becoming Significant Natural Areas which have too many restrictive controls that would not allow the vision for Tupou to come to fruition. If there is to be a net biodiversity gain- and a large one at that- then it should be promoted and enabled, rather than restricted. There will be an ongoing management plan for planting areas as to enhance the natural biodiversity but there needs to be flexibility for future potential land uses which a SNA would prohibit. Either a Managed Ecological Zone or a Special Purpose Zone needs to be granted for Tupou, to allow for future developments. This project will be restoring an extensive area back to native ecosystems with the goal of a large net biodiversity gain. This needs to be promoted and enabled while preserving future land uses options.	Allow		Accept in part
FS58.3	Harold Corbett		Support	Tupou is a large coastal Northland property that has been managed as a typical hill country sheep and beef farm. If the new owners wish to implement large scale biodiversity positive reforestation and pest control then they should be encouraged not penalised through constraints on potential future uses. Financing such operations will require multiple aligned revenue streams including from environmental tourism, carbon sequestration, sustainable farming, human enjoyment, solar energy, and other	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				as yet unknown uses. Tupou includes areas in the Rural Production and Coastal zones. Reforestation and pest control will lead to much of the property becoming significant natural area. As such, under the PDP as proposed the restrictions on activities act as strong disincentives. A Special Purpose Zone should be granted for Tupou. This would encourage implementation of the requisite management plan which would detail the biodiversity operations (plantings, pest control etc) and preserve flexibility for future potential land uses which a SNA would prohibit. The sheer size of Tupou and the extent of the planned biodiversity improvements means that a Special Purpose Zone is the most appropriate tool.			
FS83.1	Neil Mitchell		Support	Tupou is part of an ancient island chain across this part of northern New Zealand. This means that there are likely to be special ecological features only found in this region. Regrettably the land has been overgrazed and pest control minimal. A new and enlightened owner intends to restore the biodiversity of a large part of the property. It would seem that the proposed District Plan could actually penalise the owner for going to considerable personal expense to achieve a very high standard of conservation. The proposal to set the property up as a special planning zone appears to achieve the best of both worlds. The owner could pursue their high conservation goals and the council would be seen to be supporting such an initiative. By clearly separating out the different activities on the property, the owner would be making quite clear how this large property will be managed. The Tupou property has a number of important sites specifically identified within the PNA programme and also identified as	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				SNA sites. The reality is that every one of the sites is severely compromised by introduced pests and stock. A hands off approach to these sites as may occur under the current zoning, will only lead to their ongoing decline. By proposing to set aside a large area of the property as a zone primarily for biodiversity, the current owner is signalling how these sites and all native biodiversity would be protected. This proposal represents an important approach to land management, in that the owner clearly wishes to work with the council, within the planning context. The other important point, is that the owner is signalling to the council that this approach is a long term view of land management. If the current designation remains, there will always be less incentive to effectively manage the biodiversity on the property. The owner is effectively saying, allow me to create these formally recognised sub-zones, to keep all of us in line and especially enhance the security of biodiversity in the region.			
FS28.004	Dr John L Craig		Support	The proposed FNDP would result in large area of the land potentially becoming SNAs which have too many restrictive controls that would not allow the vision for Tupou to come to fruition. If there is to be a net biodiversity gain then it should be promoted and enabled, rather than restricted. There needs to be flexibility for future potential land uses which a SNA would prohibit. Either a Managed Ecological Zone or a Special Purpose Zone needs to be granted for Tupou, to allow for future developments. This project will be restoring an extensive area back to native ecosystems with the goal of a large net biodiversity gain. This needs to be promoted and enabled while preserving future land uses options.	Allow	Amend zoning Tupou from Rural Production to a new special zone such as managed ecological zone or a special purpose zone.	Accept in part
S49.001	Paul O'Connor	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	Removal of SNA maps from the PDP is unnecessary and puts the onus on	Insert SNA maps back into the PDP		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				landowners to prove bush on their property is not an SNA. This necessitates engaging an ecologist at their expense. It is not fair to assume all bush is under SNA unless proven otherwise.			
S427.030	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases.	Amend the planning maps to add areas of significant ecological value on private land which have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) [inferred].		Reject
S530.001	Victoria Yorke and Andre Galvin	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the boundary lines of the SNA mapped on Lot 1 DP 53506 ((Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect area mapped in submission		Reject
S430.002	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	SNAs and similar sites that have been protected via the council's consenting process must be clearly indicated on the district plan maps.	Amend the planning maps to identify significant natural areas and similar sites protected through the resource consent process		Reject
S430.004	Kapiro Residents Association	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	We firmly oppose the proposed zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575 (Kurapari Road) in Rural Lifestyle zone or any other residential zone. As noted in submisison, this block should be zoned in a special zoning for SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property, in order to protect high ecological at the site	Amend the zoning of Lot 3 DP 415575 (at the end of Kuripari Road) from Rural Lifestyle to special zoning for SNAs and similar ecological sites and/or given status similar to a Reserve on private property		Reject
S364.006	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Kiwi conservation is particularly important in the Far North District context. Although it is noted that the North Island Kiwi is "Not Threatened", it has only reached this improved conservation status after significant community conservation efforts. These efforts should not go to waste and specific kiwi conservation objectives, policies, and rules should therefore be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan.	Insert overlays that identify locations of 'kiwi present' or 'high-density kiwi areas', with a mechanism for updating these maps.		Reject
FS93.11	Leonie M Exel		Oppose	DOC wishes to 'lower the bar' on which species are protected. This in turn 'raises the bar' for dog owners, as it expands the	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				area where FNDC may choose to ban or restrict our dogs. A similar DOC-driven change related to the definition of 'high density kiwi.' A few years ago, this was dropped from 7 calls per night, to 5 calls per night. At the same time, the category formally known as 'kiwi absent,' where no kiwi calls were heard, was altered to become 'data deficient'. The rationale was that kiwi MIGHT have been in the area, but were not heard. Such changes to the dividing line for kiwi have major implications for dog owners. We mistrust how the changes seem to always err in favour of our dogs being banned or restricted in number. Kiwi are precious and they need our protection. The work that has been done by conservation groups in Northland is extraordinary. I agree that mapping of kiwi and other wildlife density is useful to the community. After many years of requests, FNDC has just begun to gather data on how and where dogs have been restricted across our district. If there were no negative implications for dog owners flowing from this change, I would support it wholeheartedly. As it implies further illogical banning of dogs, I cannot support it. STOP the dog bans, and restrictions on allowable dog numbers, via sub-division resource consents. This will allow all of us to unite, and focus on the methods that really will help kiwi - by reducing the number of wandering dogs.			

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.57	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	We need accurate data on the presence of our indigenous species, so I support this. However, there needs to be integrity and transparency as to how this data is collected. We all know that statistics can be manipulated to paint whatever picture is wanted. A few years ago, at the instigation of DOC, "High Density Kiwi" was reduced from 7 to 5 calls per night. "Kiwi Absent" became called "Data Deficient". It's pretty clear these changes were made to twist data to further push an agenda. The changes made by DOC are always tend towards their own goals at the cost of other parties.	Allow in part		Reject
FS25.126	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the intent behind the submission, subject to the Department providing appropriate information to identify areas and appropriate drafting of provisions.	Allow	Allow the original submission, subject to appropriately identifying areas	Reject
FS570.1087	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
FS346.146	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
FS566.1101	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
FS569.1123	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
S192.003	Thomson Survey Ltd	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	not stated	Include the 'proposed SNA map layer' as a non-statutory map layer, available to landowners and professionals to use as a guide to identifying SNA's when preparing applications.		Reject
FS67.1	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNA will need to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity before being inserted in the District Plan in any form.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.1	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Mapping of SNA will need to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity before being inserted in the District Plan in any form.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.2	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Mapping of SNA will need to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity before being inserted in the District Plan in any form.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.1	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	SNAs would need to be mapped using the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity before being included in any part of the District Plan.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.1	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNA will need to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity before being inserted in the District Plan in any form.	Disallow		Accept
S448.002	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	A number of SNAs have already been protected via the resource consent process, but they are not shown on the PDP map. There is no justification for omitting existing protected SNAs from the maps and they should be added to the map.	Amend PDP maps to include SNA's and similar sites that have been protected via the Council's consenting process		Reject
FS67.2	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.3	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS:	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.			
FS69.2	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.2	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Mapping of SNAs should follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, not as determined by a previous consenting process.	Disallow		Accept
FS569.1886	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1814	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S529.042	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays		Reject
FS67.5	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Identification of SNAs is required to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous assessments and processes which apply different criteria.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.6	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Identification of SNAs is required to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous assessments and processes which apply different criteria.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.5	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Identification of SNAs is required to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				on previous assessments and processes which apply different criteria.			
FS66.5	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Identification of SNAs is required to follow the methodology set out in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous assessments and processes which apply different criteria.	Disallow		Accept
FS570.1932	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1946	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1968	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S449.043	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays		Reject
FS67.8	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNAs should follow the methodology in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous processes.	Disallow		Accept
FS68.9	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The identification of SNAs should follow the methodology in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous processes.	Disallow		Accept
FS69.8	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNAs should follow the methodology in the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity and not be based on previous processes.	Disallow		Accept
FS66.8	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The identification of SNAs should follow the methodology in the NPS: Indigenous	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Biodiversity and not be based on previous processes.			
FS569.1842	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1859	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
S180.002	Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated		Insert new zone for SNAs and similar sites that are already protected through the Resource consenting process , and sites that will be added by future consenting. or given status similar to a Reserve on private property in order to protect high ecological areas		Reject
FS277.74	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS566.008	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.040	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.003	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
S522.029	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Miscellaneous	Support in part	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays		Reject
FS277.78	Jenny Collison		Support	I strongly agree	Allow		Reject
FS277.79	Jenny Collison		Support	I strongly agree	Allow		Reject
FS566.1768	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
S338.043	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Some areas of significant ecological value on private land have already been recognised and protected (by consent conditions, covenant, etc.) during a resource consenting process in recent years. However, the PDP map does not identify these sites and has applied entirely inappropriate zoning in some cases. This problem needs to be rectified promptly, so that existing protected sites are indicated on maps, protected by appropriate zoning and/or overlay, and are promptly included in Schedule 4 of the PDP.	Amend the planning maps to identify ecological areas already protected by resource consent conditions, consent notices, covenants etc and reconsider underlying zoning/overlays		Reject
FS277.82	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential	Allow		Reject
FS570.981	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.995	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1017	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S180.003	Kerikeri Peninsula Conservation Charitable Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Insert SNA and similar sites that have been protected via the council consenting process must be clearly indicated on the district plan maps	Insert SNA and similar sites that have been protected via the council consenting process on the district plan maps		Reject
FS566.009	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.041	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.004	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
S148.018	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not explicitly stated	Amend through working with the Forest Industry to map and schedule all SNA within the boundaries of plantation forests.		Reject
FS346.524	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)	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.			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.			
FS566.130	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
S148.057	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	While there is still uncertainty over the final form of the NPS-IB, there is little doubt that it will require SNA's to be mapped. The framework that is established under the proposed plan is neither efficient nor effective and, as recognised in the section 32 report, will shift a significant cost impost for a public good from Council to landowners and at a significant scale. This will adversely affect primary production activity in the District.	Amend through working with the Forest Industry to map and schedule all SNA within the boundaries of plantation forests; and establish a process whereby the costs of an ecologist's report on a potential SNA area is fully funded by Council when associated with primary production activity and the voluntary scheduling of SNA areas.		Reject
FS346.563	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
FS566.169	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
FS569.191	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
S567.003	Andr� Galvin	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Not stated	Amend the boundary lines of the SNA mapped on Lot 1 DP 53506 ((Puketona Road, Haruru Falls) to reflect area mapped in submission		Reject
FS348.226	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S359.004	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The National Policy Statement-Highly Productive Land will, and the National Policy Statement-Indigenous Biodiversity is likely to, take effect prior to the end of 2022 and the proposed plan will need to be reviewed in light of these new pieces of national direction	Amend the plan to have regard to the National Policy Statement-Highly Productive Land and the National Policy Statement-Indigenous Biodiversity		Accept in part
FS23.094	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support	District plans are required to give effect to higher order policy and plan instruments. It is appropriate that the provisions of the district plan be revised to the extent necessary to ensure these documents are given effect to.	Allow		Accept in part
FS305.007	Dempsey Family Trust		Oppose	The District Plan gives effect to the NPS-HPL however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS-HL that have come into force since the Proposed District Plan was prepared.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.465	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		Accept in part
FS354.003	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The submitter seeks that the plan give effect to the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPSHPL) and the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. HortNZ supports implementation of these higher order documents in the district plan.	Allow		Accept in part
FS404.007	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support in part	The D-G notes the submitter's relief has been summarised as requesting the plan be reviewed to 'have regard' to the listed national policy statements. Pursuant to section 75(3)(a) of the Act the requirement is to 'give effect' to those documents. The relief is otherwise supported.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS446.004	Omata Estate		Oppose	The Plan give effect to the NPS however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS that have come into force since the Proposed Plan was prepared.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS547.121	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The Plan give effect to the NPS however separate planning processes are required as it could create natural justice issues attempting to retrofit this planning document to make the changes required by new NPS that have come into force since the Proposed Plan was prepared.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS566.1054	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS569.1076	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1040	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow		Accept in part
FS66.10	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.			
FS67.10	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be struck out. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.11	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.			
FS69.10	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought in the submission by NRC to have regard to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity should be sought by a Schedule 1 Variation to the Proposed Plan by the FNDC, not by way of a submission. The relief sought in this submission is not specific, so as to allow landowners and the community to understand its effect, yet by introducing SNAs and associated provisions across the district, it will have significant effect. Lacking specificity as it does, the submission should be disallowed. There is no section 32 RMA assessment to support the relief sought. While it is acknowledged that the Council is required to give effect to the NPS: Indigenous Biodiversity, this is required to be done in accordance with the principles and methodology set out in the NPS, including at section 3.8 the principles of partnership, transparency, access and consistency. Giving effect to the NPS by way of a submission to the Proposed Plan falls well short of this.	Disallow		Accept in part
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".		Accept in part
FS332.168	Russell Protection Society		Support	Submission aligns with our values	Allow		Accept in part
FS404.058	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Support	Relief is consistent with the purpose of the Act.	Allow		Accept in part