

## Appendix 2 – Officer’s Recommended Decisions on Submissions (Natural Features and Landscapes)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S11.003	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	<p>The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust (the Trust) has recently purchased Elliot Bay Farm in Far North District. The Trust is generally supportive of the Far North Proposed District Plan as it affects the land it administers and notes the work of the Trust will significantly assist Council to achieve objectives in the proposed plan such as improving public access to coastal area and protecting natural character. The Trust is however concerned that some provisions of the coastal and natural character overlays may make its work expensive and difficult. The Trust is seeking clarification or amendment of these overlay provisions to allow it to upgrade and existing public camping area, construct walking tracks and undertake restoration work.</p>	<p>Amend the provisions (by way of specific controls) or at least clarification to allow the following activities to be undertaken within the land at Elliot Bay Farm (most of the farm encompassed at 1077A and 1076 Rawhiti Road, Russell or certificate of titles NA40A/1111 and NA1111/297), which is currently zoned Rural Production, with Coastal and Outstanding Natural Landscape overlays</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formation of a high quality all weather walking track that includes a section from Whangamumu Harbour to Ngaiotonga Scenic Reserve. This track (maximum width 2metres) will go above Elliot Bay (outside the Coastal hazard areas) then head inland alongside Rawhiti Road before heading inland up Wairoa Stream. (Note: maps showing possible walking tracks are attached to original submission)</li> <li>- Maintain and upgrade the existing summer camping ground at Elliot Bay with associated car parking, walking tracks and facilities NB buildings associated with this camping ground will be toilets and structures to provide water, refuse disposal etc (new built accommodation is not</li> </ul>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					planned at this site). - The potential for DOC type huts near Whangamumu and in the Wairoa Stream catchment to cater for walkers on the multi-day walk. - Directional and interpretive signs. - Restoration and amenity plantings of native species with associated fencing to exclude stock.		
<b>S157.003</b>	Tane's Tree Trust - Northland Totara Working Group	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	<p>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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2. Sustainable indigenous forestry is 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</p>	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	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				forest, including within Significant Natural Areas.				
<b>FS46.2</b>	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	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS404.0010</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	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.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>S359.041</b>	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	There are potential effects associated with carbon farming such as lack of fire breaks, closer planting spaces and resulting difficulty in pest management as well as those normally associated with production forestry such as amenity and visual effects, wilding pine and fire risk.	Amend the Plan to consider including controls on exotic carbon forestry within the coastal environment, natural character areas, ONFL and areas of elite soils to protect the values of these resources and to manage nuisance such as shading, plant pest spread and fire risk.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS108.7</b>	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.1

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.				Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS570.1077</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS346.502</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS566.1091</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS569.1113</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>S483.157</b>	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In terms of 'How the Plan Works', it is unclear how this Chapter interacts with other District Wide Chapters. Based on the exclusion of a catch all	Amend to provide clarity around interrelationship between chapters.		Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				discretionary activity status for rules not otherwise specified it is assumed that, for any activity not specified, the default activity status is permitted. This should be clarified in the Chapter itself				
<b>FS196.216</b>	Joe Carr		Support	this is important. FNDC with it's extensive knowledge should not rel on catch all tricks	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>FS345.208</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	this is important. FNDC with it's extensive knowledge should not rel on catch all tricks	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>S511.078</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	This chapter only deals with ONLs and ONFs. It also only deals with ONF and ONLS outside the coastal environment. This chapter would also be more appropriately identified as "Outstanding natural features and landscapes" to avoid confusion as to the scope of the chapter which is different to the Natural character chapter.	Amend chapter title " <b>Outstanding</b> Natural Features and <b>Outstanding</b> Landscapes"		Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>FS164.078</b>	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	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	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS570.1649</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>FS566.1663</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS569.1685</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>S436.005</b>	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC	Insert provisions that provide for the building of maimai on wetlands or near a lake or river as a permitted activity.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m<sup>2</sup>) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.</p>				<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFI-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>
<p><b>FS570.1469</b></p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 3</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m<sup>2</sup>) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFI-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS346.091	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m <sup>2</sup> ) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFI-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS566.1483	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m <sup>2</sup> ) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFI-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.				
<b>FS569.1505</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m <sup>2</sup> ) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFI-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S442.097</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	This chapter only deals with ONLs and ONFs. It also only deals with ONF and ONLS outside the coastal environment. This chapter would also be more appropriately identified as "Outstanding natural features and landscapes" to avoid confusion as to the scope of the chapter which is different to the Natural character chapter.	Amend the title of the chapter: " <b>Outstanding</b> Natural Features and <b>Outstanding</b> Landscapes"		Reject	Section 6.2.1 Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>FS346.708</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			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.			Key Issue 1: General submissions
<b>S355.018</b>	Wakaiti Dalton	Overview	Support in part	<p>We are concerned that 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 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.</p> <p>We 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).</p>	Amend the overview to recognise and provide for tangata whenua as kaitiaki, acknowledging that tikanga and mātauranga Māori play a central role in how tangata whenua manage this resource.	Awaiting recommendation	

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S183.006</b>	MLP LLC	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S226.006</b>	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S227.006</b>	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S228.006</b>	Jayesh Govind and Others	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to	Reject	Section 6.2.2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S229.006</b>	Laurie Pearson	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S231.006</b>	Ovisnegra Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S232.006</b>	Tobias Groser	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S233.006</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S234.006</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S235.006</b>	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S236.006</b>	Connemara Black Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S237.006</b>	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S238.006</b>	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S239.006</b>	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S240.006</b>	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S241.006</b>	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S352.006	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
S333.025	P S Yates Family Trust	Overview	Support in part	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. <del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology</del>	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.			
<b>S168.033</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.</p> <p>The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.</p>	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. <del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.</del>	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>S187.026</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.</p>	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories.	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.</del>		
<b>S422.006</b>	Maurice Dabbah	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S423.006</b>	Bernard Sabrier	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S222.033</b>	Wendover Two Limited	Overview	Support in part	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. <del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.</del>	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.			
<b>S434.006</b>	Francois Dotta	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S435.006</b>	Elka Gouzer	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S167.030</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	Overview	Oppose	The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	celebrated by cultural associations and stories. <del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.</del>		
<b>FS143.5</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Allow	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS566.392</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Disallow	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>S421.150</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Oppose	While Federated Farmers supports the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes, it considers that this must be done through the appropriate identification of the features and landscapes as well as with consultation with the impacted landowners who are the ones with the role of protecting such areas. Rural landowners are generally the ones who have preserved the landscapes and features on	Amend the Overview to recognise and acknowledge the role that landowners have played and still play in the preservation of outstanding natural landscapes and features	Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>their properties around their working rural environment which is why such areas still exist today. If it was not for the landowners and the ability to graze around such areas the land would not be economically viable resulting in inappropriate subdivision, use and development to fund such land ownership.</p> <p>Federated Farmers strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features. Farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance.</p>				
<b>FS143.58</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	<p>The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance.</p> <p>Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.</p>	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS196.174</b>	Joe Carr		Support	<p>The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with</p>	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.				
<b>FS285.11</b>	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS570.1382</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape,	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.				
<b>FS346.384</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS566.1396</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS569.1418</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.		inconsistent with our original submission		
<b>S511.079</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	There is need to clarify that natural landscapes and features within the coastal environment which are not identified as ONL or ONF are addressed through provisions in the Coastal environment chapter.	Amend the overview to clarify that Coastal Environment cover landscapes and natural features that are not outstanding		Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS164.079</b>	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).	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.				
<b>FS570.1650</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS566.1664</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS569.1686</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>S243.048</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	Overview	Oppose	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.</p> <p>The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state</p>	<p>Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. <del>Modification of these places has been minimal largely due</del></p>		Accept	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.</p>	<p><del>to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.</del></p>			
<p><b>FS570.606</b></p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 3</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.620	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.</p> <p>The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state.</p> <p>The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
FS569.642	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.</p> <p>The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices.</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.				
<b>S442.098</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Overview	Support in part	There is need to clarify that natural landscapes and features within the coastal environment which are not identified as ONL or ONF are addressed through provisions in the Coastal environment chapter.	Amend the overview to clarify that Coastal Environment cover landscapes and natural features that are not outstanding.		Reject	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>FS346.709</b>	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	Section 6.2.5 Key Issue 5: Overview
<b>S230.006</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).				
<b>FS566.565</b>	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	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S183.007</b>	MLP LLC	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S226.007</b>	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S227.007</b>	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S228.007</b>	Jayesh Govind and Others	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S229.007</b>	Laurie Pearson	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S231.007</b>	Ovisnegra Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
<b>S232.007</b>	Tobias Groser	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S233.007</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S234.007</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	R Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
<b>S235.007</b>	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S236.007</b>	Connemara Black Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S237.007</b>	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S238.007</b>	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S239.007</b>	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S240.007</b>	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S241.007</b>	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S352.007</b>	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S422.007</b>	Maurice Dabbah	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings./structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S423.007</b>	Bernard Sabrier	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				dwelling on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S345.009</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Objectives	Oppose	<p>The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>	<p>Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC.</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S425.033</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Objectives	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS			
<b>S434.007</b>	Francois Dotta	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S435.007</b>	Elka Gouzer	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S179.076</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Objectives	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the	Retain objectives	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.				
<b>FS51.96</b>	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS23.039</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S230.007</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>FS566.566</b>	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	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S421.151</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-01	Support in part	Objective NFL-O1 needs to be more aligned with section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The section requires	Amend Objective NFL-O1 as follows: <del>ONL and ONF are identified and managed to ensure their long-term protection for current and future</del>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. It would be better for the objective to be consistent with the section so that it recognises that certain activities may be undertaken in the landscape or feature but are still considered appropriate for that specified area. If objective NFL-O1 is amended, there is no need to retain objective NFL-O2.	generations- <b>Outstanding natural features and landscapes that are important to the identity of the District are retained and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b> or wording with similar intent			
<b>FS196.172</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS196.173</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS354.124</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	tautoko	Allow	Allow S421.151	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS534.034</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS570.1383</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS346.385</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS566.1397</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS569.1419	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S67.005	Michael John Winch	NFL-01	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain objectives		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS570.040	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS346.828	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS566.054	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S167.031	Benzen Farm Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is consistent with and does not compromise the <b>identified</b> characteristics and qualities values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.				
<b>FS143.6</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS547.034</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.				
<b>FS305.035</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS534.035</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of	Allow	Amend NFL-O2	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				ONLs and can in fact enhance them.				
<b>FS566.393</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS354.286</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S421.152</b>	Northland Federated	NFL-02	Support in part	Objective NFL-O1 needs to be more aligned with section 6(b) of the Resource Management	Delete Objective NFL-O2		Accept	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Farmers of New Zealand			Act 1991. The section requires the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. It would be better for the objective to be consistent with the section so that it recognises that certain activities may be undertaken in the landscape or feature but are still considered appropriate for that specified area. If objective NFL-O1 is amended, there is no need to retain objective NFL-O2.				
<b>FS196.171</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS570.1384</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS346.386</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS566.1398</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS569.1420</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S222.034</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is <del>consistent with</del> and does not compromise the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <del>qualities</del> <b>values</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.</p>	<p>of that landscape or feature.</p> <p>Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b></p>			<p>Section 6.2.6</p> <p>Key Issue 6: Objectives</p>
<b>FS393.020</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF</p> <p>Section 6.2.6</p> <p>Key Issue 6: Objectives</p>
<b>FS547.037</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.3</p> <p>Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF</p> <p>Section 6.2.6</p> <p>Key Issue 6: Objectives</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS305.038	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S168.034	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.</p>	<p>Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF <del>is consistent with and</del> does not compromise the <b>identified</b> characteristics and qualities values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b></p>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS547.035	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				- The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.				Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS305.036</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S187.027</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.  The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF <del>is consistent with and</del> does not compromise the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.  "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
FS547.036	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS305.037	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S243.049	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF <del>is consistent with and</del> does not compromise the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.038</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS305.039</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS570.607</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.621	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS569.643	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S333.026	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-02	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF <del>is consistent with</del> and does not compromise the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>values</b> of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively <b>The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.039</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS305.040</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S454.090</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-02	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 objective NFL-O2 as follows: <b>Subject to I-Px</b> , Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is consistent with and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of that landscape or feature.		Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS346.035</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS404.024</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
								Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS369.377</b>	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>S67.021</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-02	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain objectives		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS346.844</b>	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	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS566.070</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S67.022</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-03	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain objectives		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS346.845</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				
<b>FS566.071</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>S394.035</b>	Haitaitamarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-03	Support	This assists in effecting s 6(e) RMA.	Retain Objective NFL-O3		Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS588.035</b>	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS363.035</b>	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS538.035</b>	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS537.035</b>	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
<b>FS536.035</b>	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS535.035	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS533.035	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS532.035	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS531.035	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS530.035	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS529.035	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS528.035	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS527.035	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS526.035	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS525.035	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS524.035	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS523.035	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS522.035	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS521.035	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS520.035	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS519.035	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS518.035	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS517.035	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS516.035	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS515.035	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS514.035	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS513.035	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS512.035	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS511.035	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS510.035	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS509.035	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS508.035	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS507.035	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS506.035	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS505.035	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS504.035	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS503.035	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS502.035	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS501.035	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS500.035	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS499.035	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS498.035	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS497.035	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS496.035	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS495.035	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS494.035	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS493.035	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS492.035	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS491.035	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS490.035	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS489.035	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS487.035	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS486.035	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS485.035	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS483.035	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS482.035	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS481.035	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS480.035	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS479.035	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS478.035	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS477.035	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS476.035	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS475.035	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS474.035	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS473.035	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS472.035	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS471.035	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS470.035	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS469.035	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS468.035	Elias Reihana-Hetarakā		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS467.035	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS466.035	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS465.035	Rangimarie Muru		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS464.035	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS463.035	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS462.035	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS461.035	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS460.035	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS459.035	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS458.035	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS457.035	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS456.035	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS455.035	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS454.035	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS453.035	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS452.035	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS451.035	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS450.035	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS447.035	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS440.035	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS439.035	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS436.035	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS435.035	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS434.035	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS433.035	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS432.035	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS431.035	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS430.035	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS429.035	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS428.035	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS427.035	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS426.035	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS425.035	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS423.035	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS422.035	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS421.035	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS420.035	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS418.035	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS417.035	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS416.035	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS415.035	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS408.035	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS388.035	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS387.035	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS386.035	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS385.035	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS382.035	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS381.035	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS380.035	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS379.035	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS378.035	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS365.035	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS360.035	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS359.035	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS358.035	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS357.035	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS356.035	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS568.035	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS567.035	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS563.035	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS562.035	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS561.035	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 in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS560.035	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 in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS559.035	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS558.035	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS557.035	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS556.035	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS555.035	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS553.035	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS552.035	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS551.035	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS546.035	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS545.035	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS544.035	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS178.035	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
FS413.035	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives
S183.008	MLP LLC	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S226.008</b>	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S227.008</b>	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S228.008</b>	Jayesh Govind and Others	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S229.008</b>	Laurie Pearson	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S231.008</b>	Ovisnegra Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S232.008</b>	Tobias Groser	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S233.008</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S234.008</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S235.008</b>	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S236.008</b>	Connemara Black Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S237.008</b>	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S238.008</b>	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S239.008</b>	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
<b>S240.008</b>	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S241.008</b>	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S352.008</b>	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
S333.034	P S Yates Family Trust	Policies	Not Stated	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native plating regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
S168.042	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native plating regeneration and its	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation			
S187.034	The Shooting Box Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
S422.008	Maurice Dabbah	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S423.008</b>	Bernard Sabrier	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S345.010</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujlich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Policies	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity"	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.			
<b>S425.034</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Reject	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives And Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>S222.042</b>	Wendover Two Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S434.008</b>	Francois Dotta	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S435.008</b>	Elka Gouzer	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S431.161</b>	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: <b>That the cumulative effect of changes to the character of Outstanding Landscapes be taken into account in assessing applications for resource consent.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS67.69</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS67.101</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS143.47</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS68.100</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.				Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS69.98	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS66.101	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS66.180	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS332.161	Russell Protection Society		Support	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
S167.039	Bentzen Farm Limited	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits.	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS143.12	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs.</p> <p>ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits of such forms of subdivision and development.</p>				<p>Key Issue 7: Policies – General</p> <p>And</p> <p>Section 6.2.10</p> <p>Key Issue 10: NFL-P4</p>
FS354.125	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	<p>The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs.</p> <p>ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits</p>	Allow	Allow S167.039	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.7</p> <p>Key Issue 7: Policies – General</p> <p>And</p> <p>Section 6.2.10</p> <p>Key Issue 10: NFL-P4</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				of such forms of subdivision and development.				
<b>FS566.401</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits of such forms of subdivision and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S431.162</b>	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: <b>That the visibility of Outstanding Landscape Features, when viewed from public places, be taken into account in assessing applications for resource consent</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS67.70</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS67.102</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS143.48</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS143.49</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS68.101</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS69.99</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS66.102</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.				Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS66.181</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS332.162</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S431.163</b>	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: <b>That activities avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the scientific and amenity values associated with outstanding natural features.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS67.71</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS68.71</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS69.69</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS66.103	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS332.163	Russell Protection Society		Support	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
S431.164	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: <b>That the high value of indigenous vegetation to Outstanding Landscapes be taken into account when assessing applications for resource consents.</b>		Reject	Accept in part
FS67.72	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS67.103	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS143.50	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS68.72	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS68.102	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS69.70	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				landscape assessment practice, not a policy.				
FS66.104	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS66.182	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS332.164	Russell Protection Society		Support	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
S394.039	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Policies	Oppose	Adverse effects on cultural values must be managed appropriately as a part of any subdivision, not just considered.	Insert a new policy as follows: <b>Avoid any significant adverse cultural effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate any other adverse cultural effects.</b>		Reject	Accept in part
FS67.104	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS68.103	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.</p>				Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS69.100</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	<p>Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS66.183</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	<p>Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS588.039</b>	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS363.039</b>	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS538.039</b>	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS537.039</b>	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS536.039</b>	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS535.039</b>	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS533.039</b>	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS532.039</b>	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS531.039</b>	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS530.039</b>	Norma Evans		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS529.039</b>	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS528.039</b>	Erana Samuels		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS527.039</b>	David Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS526.039</b>	Michelle Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS525.039	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS524.039	Tania Morunga		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS523.039	Brett Larkin		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS522.039</b>	Stacey Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS521.039</b>	Marie Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS520.039</b>	Maureen Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS519.039</b>	Huia Solomon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS518.039	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS517.039	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS516.039	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS515.039</b>	Anaru Poharama		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS514.039</b>	Robert Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS513.039</b>	Ester Rangī Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS512.039</b>	Ellen Appleby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS511.039	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS510.039	Raniera Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS509.039	Clinton Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS508.039</b>	Sana Ryan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS507.039</b>	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS506.039</b>	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS505.039</b>	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS504.039	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS503.039	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS502.039	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS501.039</b>	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS500.039</b>	Whetu Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS499.039</b>	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS498.039</b>	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS497.039	Tayla Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS496.039	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS495.039	Jasmine Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS494.039</b>	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS493.039</b>	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS492.039</b>	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS491.039</b>	Mark J Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS490.039	Julia Middleton		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS489.039	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS487.039	Timothy Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS486.039</b>	John Barry Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS485.039</b>	Travis Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS483.039</b>	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS482.039</b>	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS481.039	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS480.039	Cheryl Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS479.039	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS478.039</b>	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS477.039</b>	Chase McIndoe		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS476.039</b>	Jessica Solomon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS475.039</b>	Marina Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS474.039	Steven Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS473.039	Beryl Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS472.039	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS471.039</b>	William Gary Butt		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS470.039</b>	Michael Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS469.039</b>	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS468.039</b>	Elias Reihana-Hetarakā		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS467.039	Carol Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS466.039	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS465.039	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS464.039</b>	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS463.039</b>	Jayden Murray		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS462.039</b>	Roharia Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS461.039</b>	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS460.039	Tawhai Motu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS459.039	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS458.039	Alexander John Busby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS457.039</b>	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS456.039</b>	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS455.039</b>	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS454.039</b>	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS453.039	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS452.039	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS451.039	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS450.039</b>	Georgina Laing		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS447.039</b>	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS440.039</b>	Hongi Laing		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS439.039</b>	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS436.039	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS435.039	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS434.039	Anthony Murphy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS433.039</b>	Christian Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS432.039</b>	Makarita Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS431.039</b>	Valarie Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS430.039</b>	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS429.039	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS428.039	Shane Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS427.039	Jacey Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS426.039</b>	Toni Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS425.039</b>	Florence Campbell		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS423.039</b>	Joseph Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS422.039</b>	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS421.039	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS420.039	Josephine Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS418.039	Mary Watkins		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS417.039</b>	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS416.039</b>	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS415.039</b>	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS408.039</b>	Jason Gardiner		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS388.039	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS387.039	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS386.039	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS385.039</b>	Victoria Murphy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS382.039</b>	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS381.039</b>	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS380.039</b>	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS379.039	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS378.039	Maanu Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS365.039	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS360.039</b>	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS359.039</b>	Mark Brannen		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS358.039</b>	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS357.039</b>	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS356.039	Katharine Kino		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS568.039	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS567.039	Blaze Maraki		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS563.039</b>	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS562.039</b>	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS561.039</b>	Ivan Wimoka Hataraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS560.039</b>	Dylan Hataraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS559.039	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS558.039	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS557.039	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS556.039</b>	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS555.039</b>	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS553.039</b>	Kenape Saupese		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS552.039</b>	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS551.039	Alamein Drummond		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS546.039	Shona Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
FS545.039	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
<b>FS544.039</b>	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS178.039</b>	Hera Johns		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.				
FS413.039	Charles Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
S431.165	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: <b>That landscape values be protected by encouraging development that takes in account: (a) the rarity or value of the landscape and/or landscape features; (b) the visibility of the development; (c) important views as seen from public vantage points on a public road, public reserve, the foreshore and the coastal marine area; (d) the desirability of avoiding adverse effects on the elements that contribute to the distinctive character of the coastal landscapes, especially outstanding landscapes and natural features, ridges and</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p><b>headlands or those features that have significant amenity value; (e) the contribution of natural patterns, composition and extensive cover of indigenous vegetation to landscape values; (f) Maori cultural values associated with landscapes; (g) the importance of the activity in enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being.</b></p>			
<b>FS143.51</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances landscape and natural character values.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS66.105</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances landscape and natural character values.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS332.165</b>	Russell Protection Society		Support	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				landscape and natural character values.				
<b>S179.077</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS51.97</b>	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS23.040</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>S243.057</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and	Insert new policy as follows: <b>Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.	<b>and development and provide for these activities.</b>			Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS401.018</b>	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS570.615</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS566.629</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
								Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS569.651</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S230.008</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>FS566.567</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19 Key issues 7 – 14.
<b>S356.070</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NFL-P1	Support	not stated	Retain NFL-P1 as notified		Accept	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>S67.006</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the policies		Accept	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS346.829</b>	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	Accept	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	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.				
<b>FS566.055</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>S167.032</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be</p>	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <del>qualities</del> <b>values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.				
<b>FS143.7</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS547.040</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.041</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS566.394</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S421.153</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-P2	Support in part	333.031	Amend Policy NFL-P2 to achieve consistency with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and to recognise the need to allow appropriate subdivision, use and development		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS143.59</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS196.169</b>	Joe Carr		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.				
<b>FS196.170</b>	Joe Carr		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS165.3</b>	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS272.4</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujlich		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS534.036</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				long as they are appropriate for the areas.				
<b>FS570.1385</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS346.387</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS566.1399</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS569.1421</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S394.036</b>	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P2	Support	This neatly implements s 6(b) RMA.	Retain Policy NFL-P2		Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS588.036</b>	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS285.6</b>	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS363.036</b>	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS538.036</b>	Awhina Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS537.036</b>	Maryanne June Harrison		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS536.036</b>	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS535.036</b>	Dyrell Akavi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS533.036</b>	Sidney John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS532.036</b>	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS531.036</b>	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS530.036</b>	Norma Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS529.036</b>	Aaron Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS528.036</b>	Erana Samuels		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS527.036</b>	David Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS526.036</b>	Michelle Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS525.036</b>	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS524.036</b>	Tania Morunga		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS523.036</b>	Brett Larkin		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS522.036</b>	Stacey Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS521.036</b>	Marie Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS520.036</b>	Maureen Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS519.036</b>	Huia Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS518.036</b>	William Boyd Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS517.036</b>	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS516.036</b>	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS515.036</b>	Anaru Poharama		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS514.036	Robert Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS513.036	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS512.036	Ellen Appleby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS511.036	Cedric Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS510.036	Raniera Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS509.036	Clinton Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS508.036	Sana Ryan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS507.036	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS506.036	Selwyn Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS505.036	Thomson Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS504.036	Ngarei Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS503.036	Nina Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS502.036	Rebecca Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS501.036	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS500.036	Whetu Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS499.036	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS498.036	Aaron George Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS497.036	Tayla Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS496.036	Cheryl Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS495.036	Jasmine Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS494.036	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS493.036	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS492.036	Sarah Kati Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS491.036	Mark J Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS490.036	Julia Middleton		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS489.036	Josephine Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS487.036	Timothy Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS486.036	John Barry Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS485.036	Travis Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS483.036	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS482.036	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS481.036	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS480.036	Cheryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS479.036	Jacob Hohaia		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS478.036	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS477.036	Chase McIndoe		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS476.036	Jessica Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS475.036	Marina Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS474.036	Steven Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS473.036	Beryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS472.036	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS471.036	William Gary Butt		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS470.036</b>	Michael Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS469.036</b>	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS468.036</b>	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS467.036</b>	Carol Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS466.036</b>	Janet Myra Bennett		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS465.036</b>	Rangimarie Muru		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS464.036</b>	Glennis Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS463.036</b>	Jayden Murray		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS462.036</b>	Roharia Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS461.036</b>	Vincent C Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS460.036</b>	Tawhai Motu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS459.036</b>	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS458.036</b>	Alexander John Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
<b>FS457.036</b>	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS456.036	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS455.036	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS454.036	Turei John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS453.036	Marlaine Ulrich		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS452.036	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS451.036	Ariana Bellingham		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS450.036	Georgina Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS447.036	Rangaunu Taua		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS440.036	Hongi Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS439.036	Rahera Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS436.036	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS435.036	George Hori Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS434.036	Anthony Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS433.036	Christian Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS432.036	Makarita Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS431.036	Valarie Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS430.036	Kaeo Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS429.036	Cedrick Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS428.036	Shane Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS427.036	Jacey Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS426.036	Toni Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS425.036	Florence Campbell		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS423.036	Joseph Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS422.036	Sharmaine Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS421.036	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS420.036	Josephine Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS418.036	Mary Watkins		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS417.036	Maddison Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS416.036	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS415.036	Michelle Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS408.036	Jason Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS388.036	Crystal Myra Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS387.036	Aroha Whitinui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS386.036	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS385.036	Victoria Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS382.036	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS381.036	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS380.036	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS379.036	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS378.036	Maanu Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS365.036	Roberta Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS360.036	Cameron Mccaskill		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS359.036	Mark Brannen		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS358.036	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS357.036	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS356.036	Katharine Kino		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS568.036	Bonnie Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS567.036	Blaze Maraki		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS563.036	Hohepa Fletcher		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS562.036	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS561.036	Ivan Wimoka Hataraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS560.036	Dylan Hataraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS559.036	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS558.036	Timothy John Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS557.036	Patricia Kate Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS556.036	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS555.036	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS553.036	Kenape Saupese		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS552.036	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS551.036	Alamein Drummond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS546.036	Shona Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS545.036	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS544.036	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS178.036	Hera Johns		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS413.036	Charles Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
S168.035	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the</p>	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.</p>				
<b>FS547.041</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	<p>The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.</p>	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.042</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.</p>			
S187.028	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy</p>	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities-values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.042</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.043</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S222.035</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P2	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.</p>	<p>subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.</p>			<p>Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF</p>
<p><b>FS547.043</b></p>	<p>Heron Point Limited</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided.</p> <p>The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified</p>	<p>Disallow in part</p>		<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.				
FS305.044	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S243.050	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified characteristics and qualities-values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.044</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.045</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS570.608	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS566.622	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS569.644	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.			
<b>S333.027</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P2	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.045</b>	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.046</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S454.091</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-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	Amend policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF within the		Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				submission point on I-P2 above.	coastal environment, <b>subject to Policy I-Px.</b>			Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS346.036</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS404.025</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS369.378</b>	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>S67.023</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS346.846</b>	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	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS566.072</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				
<b>S167.033</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set</p>	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS143.8</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS547.046</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS305.047	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS566.395	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S421.154	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-P3	Support in part	Policies NFL-P2, NFL-P3 and NFL-P7 need to be amended so that they are consistent with the relief sought by Federated Farmers for objectives NFL-O1 and NFL-O2 above. The policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the two layers while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 to achieve consistency with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and to recognise the need to allow appropriate subdivision, use and development		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS196.168	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS165.4	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	tautoko	Allow in part		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS272.5	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich		Support in part	tautoko	Allow in part		Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS534.037	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	tautoko	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS570.1386	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS346.388	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS566.1400	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
FS569.1422	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.8 Key Issue 8: NFL-P2
S394.037	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P3	Support in part	A number of characteristics or qualities may count towards a site qualifying as ONF or ONL. It is important that adverse effects are appropriately addressed with respect to each characteristic or quality to ensure protection on the round, as required by s 6(b) RMA.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on <b>any of</b> the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
FS588.037	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
FS285.7	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
FS363.037	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS538.037</b>	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS537.037</b>	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS536.037</b>	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS535.037</b>	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS533.037</b>	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS532.037</b>	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS531.037</b>	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS530.037</b>	Norma Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS529.037</b>	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS528.037</b>	Erana Samuels		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS527.037</b>	David Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS526.037</b>	Michelle Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS525.037</b>	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS524.037</b>	Tania Morunga		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS523.037</b>	Brett Larkin		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS522.037</b>	Stacey Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS521.037</b>	Marie Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS520.037</b>	Maureen Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS519.037</b>	Huia Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS518.037</b>	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS517.037</b>	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS516.037</b>	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS515.037</b>	Anaru Poharama		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS514.037</b>	Robert Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS513.037</b>	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS512.037</b>	Ellen Appleby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS511.037</b>	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS510.037</b>	Raniera Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS509.037</b>	Clinton Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS508.037</b>	Sana Ryan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS507.037</b>	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS506.037</b>	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS505.037</b>	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS504.037</b>	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS503.037</b>	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS502.037</b>	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS501.037</b>	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS500.037</b>	Whetu Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS499.037</b>	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS498.037</b>	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS497.037</b>	Tayla Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS496.037</b>	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS495.037</b>	Jasmine Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS494.037</b>	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS493.037</b>	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS492.037</b>	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS491.037</b>	Mark J Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS490.037</b>	Julia Middleton		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS489.037</b>	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS487.037</b>	Timothy Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS486.037</b>	John Barry Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS485.037</b>	Travis Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS483.037</b>	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS482.037</b>	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS481.037</b>	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS480.037</b>	Cheryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS479.037</b>	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS478.037</b>	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS477.037</b>	Chase McIndoe		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS476.037</b>	Jessica Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS475.037</b>	Marina Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS474.037</b>	Steven Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS473.037</b>	Beryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS472.037</b>	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS471.037</b>	William Gary Butt		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS470.037</b>	Michael Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS469.037</b>	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS468.037</b>	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS467.037</b>	Carol Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS466.037</b>	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS465.037</b>	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS464.037</b>	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS463.037</b>	Jayden Murray		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS462.037</b>	Roharia Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS461.037</b>	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS460.037</b>	Tawhai Motu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS459.037</b>	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS458.037</b>	Alexander John Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS457.037</b>	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS456.037</b>	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS455.037</b>	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS454.037</b>	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS453.037</b>	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS452.037</b>	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS451.037</b>	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS450.037</b>	Georgina Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS447.037</b>	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS440.037</b>	Hongi Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS439.037</b>	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS436.037</b>	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS435.037</b>	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS434.037</b>	Anthony Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS433.037</b>	Christian Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS432.037</b>	Makarita Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS431.037</b>	Valarie Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS430.037</b>	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS429.037</b>	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS428.037</b>	Shane Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS427.037</b>	Jacey Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS426.037</b>	Toni Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS425.037</b>	Florence Campbell		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS423.037</b>	Joseph Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS422.037</b>	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS421.037</b>	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS420.037</b>	Josephine Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS418.037</b>	Mary Watkins		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS417.037</b>	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS416.037</b>	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS415.037</b>	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS408.037</b>	Jason Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS388.037</b>	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS387.037</b>	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS386.037</b>	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS385.037</b>	Victoria Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS382.037</b>	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS381.037</b>	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS380.037</b>	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS379.037</b>	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS378.037</b>	Maanu Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS365.037</b>	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS360.037</b>	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS359.037</b>	Mark Brannen		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS358.037</b>	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS357.037</b>	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS356.037</b>	Katharine Kino		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS568.037</b>	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS567.037</b>	Blaze Maraki		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS563.037</b>	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS562.037</b>	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS561.037</b>	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS560.037</b>	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS559.037</b>	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS558.037</b>	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS557.037</b>	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS556.037</b>	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS555.037</b>	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS553.037</b>	Kenape Saupese		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS552.037</b>	Barbara May Hataraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS551.037</b>	Alamein Drummond		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS546.037</b>	Shona Hataraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS545.037</b>	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS544.037</b>	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.				Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS178.037</b>	Hera Johns		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>FS413.037</b>	Charles Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.9 Key Issue 9: NFL-P3
<b>S168.036</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	<p>By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the</p>	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Landscape Assessment methodology.  "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.				
FS547.047	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS305.048	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S187.098	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
FS547.048	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS305.050	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S222.036	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P3	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.050</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.051</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S243.051</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
FS547.051	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS305.052	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS570.609	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS566.623	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS569.645	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S333.028	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P3	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <del>qualities</del> <b>values</b> of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.				
<b>FS547.052</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.054</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S454.092</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-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 policy NFL-P3 (inferred) as follows: <b>Subject to I-Px</b> , Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
<b>FS346.037</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow in part	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS404.026	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
FS369.379	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.4 Key Issue 4: Transpower request for exemptions Addressed in Infrastructure topic
S67.024	Michael John Winch	NFL-P3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
FS346.847	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	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
FS566.073	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
S333.029	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature		
S168.037	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> that established the landscape or feature; and ...	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S222.037	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S167.034	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents.</p> <p>The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.</p> <p>"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.</p>				
<b>FS143.9</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS566.396</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S148.027</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	NFL-P4	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where	Amend NPFL-P4 to read " Provide for primary production activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. Policy NFL-P4 seeks to grandparent an existing land use that may be or could become unsustainable both in terms of economic and environmental effects. The Plan should allow for all primary production activities subject to managing any adverse effects.	not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature." and			
<b>FS85.21</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS108.15</b>	Manulife Forest Management		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.				
<b>FS354.126</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Allow	Allow S148.027	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS346.533</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.				
<b>FS566.139</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S160.021</b>	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy NFL-P4 and considers the policy to be very subjective and can be interpreted in many ways, and that including only farming and not all primary production is not fair or equitable.	Amend policy as follows: Provide for <b>primary production</b> activities within ONL and on ONF where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the use forms part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; and</li> <li>2. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.</li> </ol> to provide for primary production activities within ONL and ONF.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS85.22</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife Forest Management's	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				submission that narrowing the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.				
<b>FS346.591</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which 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	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S67.025</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P4	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS85.23</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS346.848</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
<b>FS566.074</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S159.060	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-P4	Oppose	The policy only provides for farming (including horticulture) in limited circumstances. Given the extent of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes in the Far North this is limiting	Amend Policy NFL-P4 to include an additional clause: <b>c) the activity is an existing land use</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS151.224	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS346.009	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS570.222	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS566.236	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS569.258	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
S91.010	PF Olsen Limited	NFL-P4	Oppose	Policy NFL-P4 is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 to apply to all primary production activities.		Accept	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
FS548.020	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				outstanding natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.				
<b>FS404.001</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an outstanding natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS566.099</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an outstanding natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S198.001</b>	Thomson Survey Ltd	NFL-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes NFL-P4 and contends that making any kind of farming within an ONL or ONF a discretionary activity is unjustified, unacceptable and unreasonable.	Delete NFL-P4		Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>FS332.220</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Making farming a discretionary activity in coastal areas is entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.10 Key Issue 10: NFL-P4
<b>S187.029</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified</b> characteristics and <b>qualities values</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.	that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.			qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS305.049</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Need to avoid significant effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S243.052</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the <b>identified characteristics and qualities values</b> that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS570.610</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>FS566.624</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2				
<b>FS569.646</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S333.030</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> .		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S168.038</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and <b>qualities values</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
<b>S187.030</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and <b>qualities values</b> .		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S222.038	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S559.025	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	NFL-P5	Support in part	There is no guarantee the land given back would have a known 'ancestral use' and dictating how we can utilise our treaty settlement land is contrary SD-CP-O1. It needs to be open to use and develop the land in a way that meets the aspirations of the landholders without adverse effects on the natural features and landscapes.	Amend NFL-P5 as follows: 'Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities.' (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
FS151.333	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
FS23.271	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
FS570.2215	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
FS348.052	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose		Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
FS566.2229	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS569.2251	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.11 Key Issue 11: NFL-P5
S243.053	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS570.611	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS566.625	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS569.647	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S67.026	Michael John Winch	NFL-P5	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS346.849	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	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
FS566.075	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies - General
S167.035	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
FS566.397	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	Section 6.2.3 Key Issue 3: Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF
S333.031	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P6	Support	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF areas where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
S168.039	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and		Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	enhancement of ONL and ONF <b>areas</b> <del>where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.</del>		
<b>S187.031</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF <b>areas</b> <del>where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.</del>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>S222.039</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF <b>areas</b> <del>where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.</del>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>S167.036</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF <b>areas</b> <del>where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.</del>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>FS143.10</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that the restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged in objectives and policies and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>FS566.398</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that the restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged in objectives and policies and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S243.054</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF <b>areas</b> <del>where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.</del>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>FS570.612</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>FS566.626</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>FS569.648</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.12 Key Issue 12: NFL-P6
<b>S67.027</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P6	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>FS346.850</b>	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	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS566.076</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General
<b>S167.037</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS143.11</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS547.053</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow	Delete Policy	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.055</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.399	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
S421.155	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-P7	Support in part	Policies NFL-P2, NFL-P3 and NFL-P7 need to be amended so that they are consistent with the relief sought by Federated Farmers for objectives NFL-O1 and NFL-O2 above. The policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the two layers while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Amend Policy NFL-P7 as follows: Prohibit inappropriate land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF or wording with similar intent		Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS196.167	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS534.038	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	tautoko	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS570.1387	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS346.389	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS566.1401	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS569.1423	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
S394.038	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P7	Support in part	Largely support, though note that each characteristic or quality of ONL and ONF should attract protection to ensure protection on the round.	Amend Policy NFL-P7 as follows: Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of <b>any</b> of the characteristics and or qualities of ONL and or ONF.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS588.038	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS285.8	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS363.038	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS538.038	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
FS537.038	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS536.038</b>	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS535.038</b>	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS533.038</b>	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS532.038</b>	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS531.038</b>	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS530.038</b>	Norma Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS529.038</b>	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS528.038</b>	Erana Samuels		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS527.038</b>	David Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS526.038</b>	Michelle Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS525.038</b>	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS524.038</b>	Tania Morunga		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS523.038</b>	Brett Larkin		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS522.038</b>	Stacey Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS521.038</b>	Marie Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS520.038</b>	Maureen Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS519.038</b>	Huia Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS518.038</b>	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS517.038</b>	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS516.038</b>	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS515.038</b>	Anaru Poharama		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS514.038</b>	Robert Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS513.038</b>	Ester Rangī Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS512.038</b>	Ellen Appleby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS511.038</b>	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS510.038</b>	Raniera Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS509.038</b>	Clinton Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS508.038</b>	Sana Ryan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS507.038</b>	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS506.038</b>	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS505.038</b>	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS504.038</b>	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS503.038</b>	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS502.038</b>	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS501.038</b>	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS500.038</b>	Whetu Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS499.038</b>	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS498.038</b>	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS497.038</b>	Tayla Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS496.038</b>	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS495.038</b>	Jasmine Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS494.038</b>	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS493.038</b>	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS492.038</b>	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS491.038</b>	Mark J Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS490.038</b>	Julia Middleton		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS489.038</b>	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS487.038</b>	Timothy Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS486.038</b>	John Barry Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS485.038</b>	Travis Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS483.038</b>	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS482.038</b>	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS481.038</b>	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS480.038</b>	Cheryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS479.038</b>	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS478.038</b>	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS477.038</b>	Chase McIndoe		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS476.038</b>	Jessica Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS475.038</b>	Marina Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS474.038</b>	Steven Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS473.038</b>	Beryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS472.038</b>	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS471.038</b>	William Gary Butt		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS470.038</b>	Michael Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS469.038</b>	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS468.038</b>	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS467.038</b>	Carol Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS466.038</b>	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS465.038</b>	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS464.038</b>	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS463.038</b>	Jayden Murray		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS462.038</b>	Roharia Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS461.038</b>	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS460.038</b>	Tawhai Motu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS459.038</b>	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS458.038</b>	Alexander John Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS457.038</b>	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS456.038</b>	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS455.038</b>	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS454.038</b>	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS453.038</b>	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS452.038</b>	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS451.038</b>	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS450.038</b>	Georgina Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS447.038</b>	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS440.038</b>	Hongi Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS439.038</b>	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS436.038</b>	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS435.038</b>	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS434.038</b>	Anthony Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS433.038</b>	Christian Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS432.038</b>	Makarita Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS431.038</b>	Valarie Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS430.038</b>	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS429.038</b>	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS428.038</b>	Shane Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS427.038</b>	Jacey Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS426.038</b>	Toni Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS425.038</b>	Florence Campbell		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS423.038</b>	Joseph Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS422.038</b>	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS421.038</b>	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS420.038</b>	Josephine Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS418.038</b>	Mary Watkins		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS417.038</b>	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS416.038</b>	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS415.038</b>	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS408.038</b>	Jason Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS388.038</b>	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS387.038</b>	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS386.038</b>	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS385.038</b>	Victoria Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS382.038</b>	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS381.038</b>	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS380.038</b>	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS379.038</b>	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS378.038</b>	Maanu Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS365.038</b>	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS360.038</b>	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS359.038</b>	Mark Brannen		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS358.038</b>	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS357.038</b>	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS356.038</b>	Katharine Kino		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS568.038</b>	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS567.038</b>	Blaze Maraki		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS563.038</b>	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS562.038</b>	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS561.038</b>	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS560.038</b>	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS559.038</b>	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>		<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>FS558.038</b>	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS557.038</b>	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS556.038</b>	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS555.038</b>	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS553.038</b>	Kenape Saupese		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS552.038</b>	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS551.038</b>	Alamein Drummond		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
<b>FS546.038</b>	Shona Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS545.038</b>	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS544.038</b>	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS178.038</b>	Hera Johns		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS413.038</b>	Charles Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S243.055</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value Should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.				
<b>FS401.017</b>	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS547.055</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Reject	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.059</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS570.613</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS566.627</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS569.649</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S168.040</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.				
<b>FS547.054</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.056</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S333.032</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS547.056</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.060</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S222.040</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities'	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.				
<b>FS547.057</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.058</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S187.032</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF.  Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS547.058</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS305.057</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S67.028</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P7	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Reject	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
								Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS346.851</b>	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	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>FS566.077</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.13 Key Issue 13: NFL-P7
<b>S356.071</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NFL-P8	Support	not stated	Retain NFL-P8 as notified		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S167.038</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS547.059</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.061</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS534.039</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS566.400</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S168.041</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P8 (inferred) seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS547.060</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.062</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S243.056</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P6 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to)	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.				
<b>FS547.061</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.065</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS570.614</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS566.628</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS569.650</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S333.033</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P6 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent,	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.				
<b>FS547.062</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.066</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S187.033</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: this is not a policy but a method of assessment, and more appropriately an assessment criterion; and non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against clear objectives and policies.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS547.122</b>	Heron Point Limited		Support	The Submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete policy NFL-P8	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.063</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The Submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S222.041</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P8 (inferred) seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS305.064</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S67.029</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-P8	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>FS346.852</b>	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	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS566.078</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.14 Key Issue 14: NFL-P8
<b>S183.009</b>	MLP LLC	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S226.009</b>	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S227.009</b>	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme,	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Trustee Company Limited			do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S228.009</b>	Jayesh Govind and Others	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S229.009</b>	Laurie Pearson	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S231.009</b>	Ovisnegra Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S232.009</b>	Tobias Groser	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S233.009</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S234.009</b>	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S235.009</b>	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S236.009</b>	Connemara Black Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

<b>Submission Point</b>	<b>Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>	<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<b>Relevant section of s42A report</b>
<b>S237.009</b>	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S238.009</b>	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S239.009</b>	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
<b>S240.009</b>	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S241.009</b>	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S352.009</b>	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
<b>S497.005</b>	Mark John Wyborn	Rules	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S493.006</b>	William Goodfellow	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend all provision in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S494.006</b>	Ian Jepson	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend all provision in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S422.009</b>	Maurice Dabbah	Rules	Support	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretionary and assessment criteria that give effect to	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S423.009</b>	Bernard Sabrier	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
<b>S345.011</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Rules	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.			
<b>S491.004</b>	Eric Kloet	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S425.035</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives And Section 6.2.7 Key Issue 7: Policies – General And Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S222.044	Wendover Two Limited	Rules	Oppose	<p>There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary</p>	<p>Insert a new rule as follows: "<b>New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000</b>" Specify the activity status as <b>controlled activity</b> Insert the following matter of control: <b>a. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice.</b> Insert the following clause: <b>Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>cost and risk to current owners.</p> <p>Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices.</p> <p>Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage. A similar provision is in the Operative Whangarei District Plan 2022.</p>			
<b>S434.009</b>	Francois Dotta	Rules	Oppose	<p>The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.</p>	<p>Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions</p> <p>Addressed in Hearing 19</p>
<b>S435.009</b>	Elka Gouzer	Rules	Oppose	<p>The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not</p>	<p>Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.2</p> <p>Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions</p> <p>Addressed in Hearing 19</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
<b>S490.004</b>	Owen Burn	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S492.004</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings.			
<b>S363.036</b>	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect.</li> <li>2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules.</li> <li>3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology.</li> </ol> <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S516.084</b>	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	<p>The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a</p>	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone).                      This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users:                      1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect.                      2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules.                      3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology.                      Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>			
S167.041	Bentzen Farm Limited	Rules	Oppose	<p>There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes</p>	<p>Insert new rule as follows: "<b>New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000</b>"                      Specify the activity status as <b>controlled activity</b>                      Insert the following matter of control: 1. <b>Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice.</b>                      Insert the following clause: <b>Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the</b></p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	<b>Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b>			
FS143.13	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
<b>FS383.2</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	<p>The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.</p>	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS384.2</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.</p>				Key Issue 15: Rules - General
FS566.403	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent.</p> <p>The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association.</p> <p>The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.</p>			
<b>S91.016</b>	PF Olsen Limited	Rules	Oppose	<p>There is no justification to require plantation forestry earthworks to comply with more stringent standards for earthworks in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays, and for those standards to also not equally apply to other primary production land use.</p> <p>Rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays are already in the plan for plantation forestry activities in these overlays. Plantation forestry activities include earthworks.</p>	<p>Amend the rules for plantation forestry activities in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays limiting to only apply to plantation forestry earthworks. Delete the irrelevant Matters of Discretion for earthworks in Natural Features and Landscapes overlays.</p> <p>Amend the rules to provide consistency of application for primary production activities.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Earthworks are undertaken in the main to provide access and infrastructure. The proposed standards might be applicable to land recontouring activities but not earthworks for plantation forestry.</p> <p>The drafting provides a legal nonsense in that replanting plantation forest is a discretionary activity (under rules NFL-R5 and CE-R6) but is required for the earthworks to be permitted under this standard and rule EW-R7.</p> <p>The earthworks Matters of Discretion go well beyond the scope of the District Council's powers under section 31 of the Resource Management Act.</p>				
<b>FS176.16</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	As set out in the original submission	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS108.16</b>	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As set out in the original submission	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
								Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS566.105</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As set out in the original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S179.078</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal	Retain rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.				
<b>FS51.98</b>	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>FS23.041</b>	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>S148.029</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.	Amend rules to provide for existing Plantation Forestry and Plantation Forestry Activities in an ONL and/or ONF as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS108.17</b>	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
								Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS346.535</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS566.141</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S483.160</b>	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks inclusion as a permitted activity for upgrades to existing electricity infrastructure that cannot	Insert a new rule as follows (or to the same effect)): <b>NFL-RX Upgrade of electricity network utilities</b> Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER - 1 The		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>comply with NFL - R1 PER (3) relating to 20% GFA and PER 4 relating to NFL-31 maximum height.</p> <p>Given that these network utilities are already present on the landscape, Top Energy seeks to ensure that they can be appropriately upgraded to meet the demands of technology, and ensure continued resilient, flexible and adaptable supply throughout the District.</p> <p>Top Energy also notes, that given the interdependencies of Top Energy's networks, some of the lower voltage lines within these rural coastal communities meet the criteria of Regionally Significant Infrastructure.</p> <p>Top Energy considers that the amendments sought result in better alignment with RPS policies (5.2.2 and 5.3.2 in particular).</p>	<p><b>upgrade of electricity network utility structures or buildings:1. is within 5m of the existing alignment location of the original structure or building;2.does not increase the gross floor area by more than 30 percent in a 10-year period if it is a building;3.complies with the zones permitted setback standards if it is a building;4.does not result in pole or tower height that exceeds 25m above ground level;5.does not result in more than two additional poles;6.does not result in additional towers; and7.any additional cross arms do not exceed a length of more than 4m.</b></p>			
<b>FS196.218</b>	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>FS346.083</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>FS345.211</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S496.005</b>	Philip Thornton	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>FS411.005</b>	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General
<b>S511.083</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert a new rule Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONL Activity Status: non-complying		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Reules - General
<b>FS164.083</b>	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must	Allow	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland	Reject	Section 6.2.15

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>		<p>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.</p>		Key Issue 15: Reules - General
FS570.1654	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	<p>Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission</p>	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Reules - General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS566.1668</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS569.1690</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>S511.084</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert New Rule "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONF Activity Status: prohibited"		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Reules - General
<b>FS164.084</b>	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	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Reules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS570.1655</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.1669</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
FS569.1691	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
S243.059	Matauri Trustee Limited	Rules	Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and	Insert new rule as follows: <b>New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan.</p> <p>This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision.</p> <p>As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision.</p> <p>In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected.</p> <p>The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners.</p> <p>Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have</p>	<p><b>subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000</b></p> <p>Specify the activity status as controlled activity</p> <p>Include the following matter of control:<b>1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice.</b></p> <p>Include the following clause:<b>Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.</p>				
FS570.617	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	<p>There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>subdivision.</p> <p>In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected.</p> <p>The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners.</p> <p>Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices.</p> <p>Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate.</p> <p>Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				have occurred already at subdivision stage.				
FS566.631	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision.</p> <p>As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision.</p> <p>In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected.</p> <p>The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners.</p> <p>Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate.</p> <p>Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.</p>				
<b>FS569.653</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan.</p> <p>This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>result in more such forms of subdivision.</p> <p>As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision.</p> <p>In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected.</p> <p>The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners.</p> <p>Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices.</p> <p>Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as</p>				

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.				
<b>S359.032</b>	Northland Regional Council	Rules	Support in part	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Amend the rules to expand the permitted activity rule to allow for fencing within natural character areas, ONLs and ONFs where fencing is required for protection or enhancement of soil conservation treatments, water bodies and wetlands and in line with the Stock Exclusion Regulations and/or regional plan rules.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS570.1068</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.493</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.1082</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS569.1104	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
FS373.007	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
S442.102	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert new rule: "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONL Activity Status: Non-Complying"		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
FS346.713	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S442.103</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Neutral	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert new rule: "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONF Activity Status: Prohibited"		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.714</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S344.044</b>	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>cause confusion for plan users:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect.</li> <li>2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules.</li> <li>3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology.</li> </ol> <p>Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.</p>				
<b>FS396.065</b>	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	<p>The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.</p>	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S230.009</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Rules	Oppose	<p>The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).</p>	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Reject	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.568	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	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19
SS11.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Notes	Support in part	For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule NFL-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter There may be further significant indigenous biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with the RPS. As well there may be other vegetation that requires protection in alignment with the RPS, policy 4.4.1.	Amend notes The Earthworks <b>and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</b> Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks <b>and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters</b> earthworks <b>indigenous vegetation rules</b> , the most stringent rule will apply.		Accept	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes
FS164.080	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	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	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS570.1651</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes
<b>FS566.1665</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
FS569.1687	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes
S442.099	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Notes	Support	<p>For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule NFL-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter. There may be further significant indigenous</p>	<p>Amend notes: The Earthworks <b>and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</b> Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks <b>and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters</b> earthworks</p>		Accept	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with the RPS. As well there may be other vegetation that requires protection in alignment with the RPS, policy 4.4.1.	<b>indigenous vegetation rules</b> , the most stringent rule will apply.			
<b>FS346.710</b>	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	Section 6.2.16 Key Issue 16: Notes
<b>S421.156</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R1	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the recognition in rule NFL-R1 of the functional need for ancillary to farming structures to be in place. The workability of the 25m2 maximum area in performance standard PER-1 means that almost every ancillary farming structure / building will require a consent under discretionary which is not appropriate. The 25m2 maximum area restriction means that even a small kitset residential garage would be required to apply for a consent. For a farm building/structure this means that the rule does not provide for the necessary buildings (such as barns and machinery storage sheds) that a farmer relies upon to effectively operate within the landscape.	Amend PER-1 (inferred) of Rule NFL-R1 so that the maximum area of structures is 250m <sup>2</sup> instead of 25m <sup>2</sup>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Farmers and the Council will find themselves going through the resource consent process for everyday buildings and structures that form part of normal farming operations, and which have no more than minor impacts on the values of outstanding natural landscapes and features.				
<b>FS24.18</b>	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS196.166</b>	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS285.12</b>	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS165.5</b>	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS272.6</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS570.1388</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.390</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS566.1402</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS569.1424</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				
FS369.388	Top Energy		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S167.040	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	<p>The building per-se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone.</p> <p>The rule fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs.</p> <p>The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission.</p>	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows:</p> <p>Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: <del>1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);</del> <b>1. no greater than 25 50m2 .</b> PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: <del>1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);</del> <b>12. no greater than 25 50m2.</b> PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Insert the following rule:<b>PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b></p>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature.                      Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration.</p>	<p>Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying to <b>restricted discretionary</b> in the case of each rule.                      Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a <b>non-complying activity</b>.                      Insert a matter of discretion as follows:  <b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or</p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p><b>farming use of the lot. m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b>                      Insert new clause as follows:<b>Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>			
FS143.26	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS393.012	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
<b>FS401.009</b>	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS305.067</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.402	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS369.381	Top Energy		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S493.004	William Goodfellow	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.				
<b>FS67.113</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS68.111</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.393</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.				
<b>S159.061</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R1	Oppose	The policy only provides for buildings and structures in very limited circumstances. Given the extent of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes in the Far North this is very limiting.	Amend subsection 2 of PER-1 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: (2) no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> 100m <sup>2</sup>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS151.225</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS151.226</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS393.009</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS534.040</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support		Allow	Amend subsection 2 of PER- 1 of Rule NFL-R1	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.0010</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS570.223</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS566.237</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS569.259	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S483.158	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	<p>No provision has been made to allow for new network utilities of an appropriate scale within these environments. Top Energy generally supports a preference to underground infrastructure where possible in ONL and ONFs, but this needs to be enabled and may require additional network utility buildings and structures (e.g., transformers and pillars) above ground to facilitate this which would otherwise comply with the 25m<sup>2</sup> and 5m height limit afforded to buildings and structures ancillary to farming. On review of the s32 analysis for the Coastal Environment, it is understood that structures associated with primary production are enabled; this analysis does not expressly identify why. However, it is assumed it is because farming activities are a common fixture within this environment and that farming is a dominant primary sector industry within the District as is highlighted in the s32 Overview). Given that connection to electricity infrastructure is critical to such operations, Top Energy seeks that the same permitted activity threshold applies to network utilities. Further Top Energy notes that</p>	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows (or to the same effect): ."PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside <b>or inside</b> the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit) <b>or a network utility</b> ; 2. no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> . <del>PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 2. no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup>.</del>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1	

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				PER-2 thresholds duplicate that in PER-1.				
<b>FS196.217</b>	Joe Carr		Support	provides for an essential service	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS111.084</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	provides for an essential service	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS345.209</b>	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	provides for an essential service	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S495.003</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity.	Delete Rule NFL-R1 (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS78.021</b>	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The proposed Rule does not provide for infrastructure such as the National Grid to be located within these areas where there is a functional or operational need to locate such infrastructure there and there is no other practicable location. This does not appropriately give effect to policies 2, 3, 4 and 8 of the NPSET.	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS410.003	Craig Heatley		Support	The proposed Rule does not provide for infrastructure such as the National Grid to be located within these areas where there is a functional or operational need to locate such infrastructure there and there is no other practicable location. This does not appropriately give effect to policies 2, 3, 4 and 8 of the NPSET.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S495.006	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS78.022	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS410.006	Craig Heatley		Support	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS369.395	Top Energy		Support in part	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.				
<b>S454.093</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-R1	Not Stated	There is no difference between the requirements of PER-1 and PER-2 and the rule does not allow for the provision of new infrastructure. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any area within the Far North District. While Transpower is required to seek to avoid locating transmission facilities within sensitive areas, there may be occasions when sensitive areas cannot be avoided and, in these cases, critical infrastructure needs to be provided for.	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 <del>if a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:</del> 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); <b>and</b> 2. no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> . <b>The new building or structure is for infrastructure.</b> PER-2 <del>if a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:</del> 3. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 4. no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> .	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1	
<b>FS111.083</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.038</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS404.027</b>	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS369.389	Top Energy		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S496.003	Philip Thornton	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS411.003	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS369.401	Top Energy		Support in part	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S46.002	David King	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that NFL-R1/Per-2, as it applies to new buildings or structures	Amend NFL-R1/Per-2 to include residential units within a coastal		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				within a coastal environment, is too prohibitive. The submitter considers that it should be a person's right to build a residential unit along with any required ancillary structure on land to which they have guaranteed title to and that the Local Authority (FNDC) sees fit to levy payable rates on that land. And, that any required earthworks to achieve that activity should also be included as being permitted.	environment and to also permit earthworks related to that activity.			
<b>FS393.002</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS401.002</b>	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.380</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S168.043</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. <del>ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);</del> 1.2. no greater than 25 50m <sup>2</sup> . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: <del>1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);</del> 12. no greater than 25 50m <sup>2</sup> .		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs.</p> <p>Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m<sup>2</sup>, rather than 25m<sup>2</sup>, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments.</p> <p>Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is</p>	<p>PER-3 ...            PER-4 ...            Insert the following rule:  <b>PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b>            Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule.            Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity.            Insert a matter of discretion as follows:<b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input	<p><b>processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b>                      Insert a new clause as follows:<b>Building/s which do not comply with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>			
<b>FS305.068</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.382</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S187.035</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: the building per-se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled; the failure to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits.; inclusion of limitation of dwellings as per drafting proposed at PER-5; the rules ignores that there are titles,	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:4- ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit) 1. 2. no greater than <del>25</del> <b>50m2</b> . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:4- ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit)1 2. no greater than 25 <b>50m2</b> .		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>including titles with approved building platforms; 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds; non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity; and except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration.</p>	<p>PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure.</p> <p>PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Add the following rule:<b>PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b> Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying to <b>restricted discretionary</b> in the case of each rule. Add a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a <b>non-complying activity</b>. Add a matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity d. the ability of the environment to absorb change e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be</p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature. j. the natural landform and processes of the location; and k. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities; l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.			
<b>FS305.069</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.383</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S222.043</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1. 2. no greater than 25-50m2 . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1. 2. no greater than 25 50m2.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m<sup>2</sup>, rather than 25m<sup>2</sup>, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of</p>	<p>PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials <b>PER-5 Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b> Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from <del>discretionary</del> /non-complying to <b>restricted discretionary</b> in the case of each rule. Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a <b>non-complying activity</b>. Insert matter of discretion as follows: <b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b> <b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;</b> <b>b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;</b> <b>c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;</b> <b>d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;</b> <b>e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;</b> <b>f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;</b> <b>g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative</b></p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	<p><b>locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.i. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.Insert a new clause as follows:</b>  <b>Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>			
<b>FS305.070</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.384</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S243.058</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows:                      Activity status: Permitted                      Where:                      PER-1                      If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:                      1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);                      1. 2. no greater than 25 50m² .</p>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m<sup>2</sup>, rather than 25m<sup>2</sup>, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural</p>	<p>PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:1- ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1 2. no greater than 25 50m<sup>2</sup>. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Add the following rule:<b>PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b> Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Add matters of discretion as follows:1. <b>The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;e.</b></p>		



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>environments.                      Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature.                      Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input</p>	<p><b>the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b>                      Add new clause as follows:<b>Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>		
<b>FS305.071</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS570.616</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.630	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS569.652	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS369.385	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S333.035	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs.	<p><i>Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1- ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1. 2. no greater than 2550m<sup>2</sup> . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: 1- ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1 2. no greater than 2550m<sup>2</sup>. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials</i>                      Insert the following rule: <b>PER-5 Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot.</b>                      Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of</p>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m<sup>2</sup>, rather than 25m<sup>2</sup>, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and</p>	<p>each rule.            Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as anon-complying activity.            Insert matters of discretion as follows:            1. <i>The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</i> <b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity; d. the ability of the environment to absorb change; e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; j. the natural landform and processes of the location; and k. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b>            Insert new clause as follows:  <i>Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited</i></p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				need not involve third party input.	<i>notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</i>			
<b>FS305.072</b>	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.387</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.406</b>	Top Energy		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S67.007</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.830</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.056</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS369.563</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				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.				Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S277.016</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-R1	Oppose	Approximately 270ha of our farm falls into the Outstanding Natural Feature overlay. I support the permission to establish new buildings ancillary to farming but oppose the exclusion of residential unit and the restriction to 25m2. As we transition from ruminant farming to intensive horticulture we will need more buildings and dwellings - to reduce carbon emissions and prosper.	Amend rule NFL-R1 as following: 'PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 2. no greater than 25m2.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.386</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S490.003</b>	Owen Burn	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous.	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes		Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.				
<b>FS369.390</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S491.003</b>	Eric Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes		Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.391</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S492.003</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes		Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings.				
<b>FS369.392</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.396</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part		Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S494.004</b>	Ian Jepson	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS369.394</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				network utility buildings and structures.			
S497.013	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-R1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS369.402	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	R Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S502.038	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R1	Support in part	It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m2 and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m2 within sites containing an outstanding landscape overlay, will meet the objectives and policies of the overlay by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater than 25m2. The	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:  1. ancillary to farming <b>and no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup></b> (excluding a residential unit); <b>or</b> 2. <b>a non-habitable building not ancillary to</b> farming no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> .  PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:  1. ancillary to farming <b>and no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup></b> (excluding a residential unit); <b>or</b> 2. <b>a non-habitable building not ancillary to</b> farming no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> .	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				reasoning behind this is that there are areas which are within ONF or ONL which are not used for farming activities, such a small gardening/storage sheds. Therefore, provision is required for non-habitable buildings not associated with farming activities. Once again, the height, colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 25m <sup>2</sup> or less is not considered to adversely affect the characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF.	In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.		
FS369.403	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S503.020	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R1	Not Stated	It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> within sites with an outstanding landscape overlay, will meet the objectives and policies of the overlay by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:  1. ancillary to farming <b>and no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup></b> (excluding a residential unit); <b>or</b> 2. <b>a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming</b> no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup> . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:  1. ancillary to farming and no greater than 25m <sup>2</sup>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup>. The reasoning behind this is that the area which is subject to the Outstanding Landscape overlay within the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not used for farming activities. Therefore, provision is required for non-habitable buildings not associated with farming activities. Once again, the height and colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 25m<sup>2</sup> or less is not considered to adversely affect the characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF.</p>	<p>(excluding a residential unit);or                      2. a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m<sup>2</sup>.                      In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.</p>		
<b>FS369.404</b>	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S333.036</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R2	Oppose	<p>There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant</p>	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.</p>			
<p><b>S168.044</b></p>	<p>Setar Thirty Six Limited</p>	<p>NFL-R2</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and</p>	<p>Delete Rule NFL-R2</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				unnecessary consent processes.			
<b>S187.036</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	<p>There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance.</p> <p>Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay.</p>	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S222.045</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	<p>There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay.</p> <p>Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent</p>	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.</p>			
<p><b>S421.157</b></p>	<p>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand</p>	<p>NFL-R2</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Federated Farmers seeks that additional activities be included under the permitted threshold in rule NFL-R2. There are activities that are important for the continued viability and operational level for both landowners and emergency services to carry out their duties. These activities may include works that are located within an outstanding natural landscape and/or feature. Examples of such activities included (but are not limited to) activities ancillary to farming activities, emergency related activities for fire, flooding etc and biosecurity related works. Providing for emergency works is necessary to ensure that landowners undertaking necessary work to manage a sudden emergency event can be done without breaching district plan rules. Biosecurity related works are also relevant to ensure clearance can be done due to the increased risk of biosecurity breaches being</p>	<p>Amend PER-1 of Rule NFL-R2 to include additional activities, being farming activities, emergency services work, and biosecurity works</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				spread around to flora and fauna.				
<b>FS24.19</b>	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS143.60</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS196.165</b>	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS285.13</b>	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS165.6</b>	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS272.7</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS570.1389</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.391</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS566.1403</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS569.1425</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS369.407	Top Energy		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S167.042	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	Repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule NFL-R2		Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS143.14	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS393.013	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				normal land management practices.				
FS401.0010	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
FS566.404	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Disallow		Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S503.021	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R2	Not Stated	We are unsure whether it is the intent of the plan to cover just historic features or whether this rule seeks to extend wider to other elements which may not be historic. Regardless of this fact we seek that the following features also be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within the coastal environment and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there	Amend Rule NFL-R2 to insert four new matters as follows: <b>Carparking areas</b> <b>Board walks</b> <b>Boat ramps</b> <b>Buildings or structures</b>  In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like.</p> <p>The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. The Operative Plan provided for renovation and maintenance of buildings as a permitted activity, with no requirement for scale, size and materials being like for like. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal is preserved and enhanced.</p>				
FS51.37	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a heritage focused planning framework over Waitangi, specifically, the extent of Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds as identified through	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>the National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu.</p> <p>Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand.</p> <p>The planning framework sought by HNZPT is to correctly reflect and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision is to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the management of facilities located at the Treaty Grounds.</p>				
FS369.564	Top Energy		Oppose	<p>HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a heritage focused planning framework over Waitangi, specifically, the extent of Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds as identified through the National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu.</p> <p>Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand.</p> <p>The planning framework sought by HNZPT is to correctly reflect and protects the heritage significance of the</p>	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				place. However, if the decision is to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the management of facilities located at the Treaty Grounds.				
<b>S243.060</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule NFL-R2		Accept	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS570.618</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.</p>				
<b>FS566.632</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS569.654</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.</p>				
<b>S160.022</b>	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-R2	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes rule NFL-R2 PER-1 as it is considered that the inclusion of farming tracks but the exclusion of plantation forestry tracks is not fair or equitable.</p>	Amend rule to include production forestry tracks.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.592</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	<p>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.</p>	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S67.030</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS346.853</b>	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	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS566.079</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S483.159</b>	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R2	Support	Top Energy supports the repair or maintenance of network utilities as a permitted activity	Retain Rule NFL-R2		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>FS345.210</b>	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	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
<b>S277.017</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-R2	Support	I support the ability to repair & maintain as per the listed activities in PER-1. Repairs and maintenance are an essential component of sustainable business and land use.	Retain NFL-R2 PER-1.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS369.405	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S502.039	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R2	Support in part	<p>We seek that additional features be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within areas of ONF and ONL and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like.</p> <p>The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved and enhanced.</p>	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R2 to insert four new matters as follows:  <b>Carparking areas</b>  <b>Board walks</b>  <b>Boat ramps</b>  <b>Buildings or structures</b></p> <p>In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS369.408	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1
S277.018	Alec Jack	NFL-R3	Support	I support the ability to undertake earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Retain NFL-R3.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.18 Key Issue 18: NFL-R2
S333.037	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class.</p> <p>More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows:</b>  <i>Activity status: Permitted</i>  <i>Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.</i></p> <p><b>1. Required for the repair maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:</b> 1. roads. 2. fences 3. network utilities 4. driveways and access 5. walking tracks 6. cycling tracks 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p>	<p><i>forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3 Except as permitted under PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary / non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule.</i></p> <p>Insert a matter of discretion as follows: 1. <i>The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the ability of the environment to absorb change; c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to</i></p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p><i>be sited in the particular location; e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; i. the natural landform and processes of the location; and j. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</i></p> <p>Insert new clause as follows:  <b>Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>		
S168.045	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these.                      Repair and maintenance</p>	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows:                      Activity status: Permitted                      Where:                      PER-1                      The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: <del>1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.</del> <b>1. Required for the</b></p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17                      Key Issue 17: NFL-R1                      And                      Section 6.2.19                      Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</li> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings)</li> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition.</p> <p>In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The</p>	<p><b>repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. roads.</li> <li>2. fences.</li> <li>3. network utilities.</li> <li>4. driveways and access.</li> <li>5. walking tracks.</li> <li>6. cycling tracks.</li> <li>7. farming tracks.</li> </ol> <p>2. ... 3. .... 4.... 5. ...</p> <p>6. <b>for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.</b></p> <p>7. <b>for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.</b></p> <p>8. <b>for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.</b></p> <p>9. <b>required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.</b></p> <p>10. <b>required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.</b></p> <p>11. <b>required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.</b></p> <p>12. <b>required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road.</b></p> <p>PER-2 <b>Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies</b></p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>	<p>with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance <b>PER-3</b><del>Except as permitted under PER-1</del> <del>the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1</del> but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule.</p> <p>Insert a matter of discretion as follows:<b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p>contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.  <b>k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.I. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b>                      Insert a new clause as follows:<b>Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>		
S187.037	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks given PER-1; repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself; more exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for; the need for earthworks exemptions is heightened with the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019; non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity - Policy NFL-P8 provides the necessary matters of</p>	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows:                      Activity status: Permitted                      Where:                      PER-1                      The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:<del>1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.</del><b>1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks.</b>                      2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines.                      3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17                      Key Issue 17: NFL-R1                      And                      Section 6.2.19                      Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				assessment; importance of providing development on previously approved building platforms; and a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	<p>4. for biosecurity reasons.</p> <p>5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.</p> <p><b>6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.</b></p> <p>7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.</p> <p>8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.</p> <p>9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.</p> <p>10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.</p> <p>11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.</p> <p>12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road.</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> <b>Except as permitted under PER-1,</b> <del>the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance</del></p> <p><b>PER-3</b> <b>Except as permitted under PER-1,</b> <del>the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance.</del></p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p>Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, Per-2 and PER-3 from discretionary / non-complying to <b>restricted discretionary</b> in the case of each rule.</p> <p>Add a matter of discretion as follows:1.</p> <p><b>The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects<b>b.</b> the ability of the environment to absorb change<b>c.</b> the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clear<b>d.</b> the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular locatione. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature<b>f.</b> any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6<b>g.</b> the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature<b>h.</b> the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature<b>i.</b> the natural landform and processes of the location<b>j.</b> any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities<b>k.</b> Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot<b>l.</b> Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</p> <p>Add new clause as</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section95B(2) and (3).		
S222.046	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R3	Support	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic</li> </ul>	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: <del>1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.</del> <b>1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks.</b> 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. <b>6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings)</li> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition.</p> <p>In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously</p>	<p><b>maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road.</b></p> <p>PER-2<b>Except as permitted under PER-1, T</b>he earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment <del>is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance</del></p> <p>PER-3<b>Except as permitted under PER-1 T</b>he earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment <del>is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance</del></p> <p>Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from <del>discretionary /non-complying to restricted discretionary</del> in the case of each rule.</p> <p>Insert the matter of discretion as follows:<b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard</b></p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>	<p><b>to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.Insert a new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S222.047	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature; While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characterises of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation</p>	<p>Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.				
<b>S421.158</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R3	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks that additional activities be included under the permitted threshold in rule NFL-R3. There are activities that are important for the continued viability and operational level for both landowners and emergency services to carry out their duties. These activities may include works that are located within an outstanding natural landscape and/or feature. Examples of such activities included (but are not limited to) activities ancillary to farming activities, emergency related activities for fire, flooding etc and works required for access.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NFL-R3 to include additional activities, being farming activities, emergency services works, and works required for access		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS24.20</b>	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS143.61</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS196.164	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS285.14	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS165.7	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS272.8	Nicole Way and Christopher Huljich		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS534.041	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow	Amend PER-1 of Rule NFLR3	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS570.1390	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS346.392	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS566.1404	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS569.1426	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
S167.043	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: <del>1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted</del>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>these.                      More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for.                      The need for exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>	<p>under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.  <b>1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:</b>                      1. roads.                      2. fences                      3. network utilities                      4. driveways and access                      5. walking tracks                      6. cycling tracks                      7. farming tracks.                      2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines.                      3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety.                      4. for biosecurity reasons.                      5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.  <b>6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.</b>  <b>7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.</b>                      8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.                      9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.                      10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.                      11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.                      12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p>road.</p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Except as permitted under <b>PER-1</b>, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3-<b>PER-1</b> but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance</p> <p><b>PER-3</b> Except as permitted under <b>PER-1</b> the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3-<b>PER-1</b> but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance</p> <p>Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary /non complying to <b>restricted discretionary</b> in the case of each rule.</p> <p>Insert a matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p>1. <b>The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b></p> <p>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;</p> <p>b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;</p> <p>c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;</p> <p>d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;</p> <p>e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;</p> <p>f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;</p> <p>g. the</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
					<p>characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</p> <p>Insert new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</p>		
FS143.15	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The applicant agrees that further exceptions to the rule should be made for normal farming and rural practices. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the definition referred to in the rule already. The further submitter also considers that in relation to Mataka Station, earthworks and vegetation clearance should be a permitted activity where they enable residential activity and buildings in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the	Allow in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consented House Site location.				
<b>FS566.405</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The applicant agrees that further exceptions to the rule should be made for normal farming and rural practices. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the definition referred to in the rule already. The further submitter also considers that in relation to Mataka Station, earthworks and vegetation clearance should be a permitted activity where they enable residential activity and buildings in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S167.044</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	This rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the	Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.				
<b>FS143.16</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may be required for every new future aspect of the operation.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS401.011</b>	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				be required for every new future aspect of the operation.				
<b>FS566.406</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may be required for every new future aspect of the operation.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S159.062</b>	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R3	Support	Clearance for biosecurity purposes is supported.	Retain subsection 4 of PER-1 of Rule NFL-R3		Accept	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS151.227</b>	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS570.224</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS566.238</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS569.260</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S495.012</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R3	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to PER-3 of Rule NFL-R3		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS410.012</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S511.081</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection	NFL-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL -R3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Society of New Zealand				ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.			
<b>FS164.081</b>	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	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	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS548.164</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	<p>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</p>	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS570.1652</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS566.1666</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS569.1688</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S483.161</b>	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R3	Not Stated	<p>Top Energy supports NFL-R3 in particular PER- 1 (2) but seeks that this be extended to provide for upgrading as provided for in the new rule sought.</p> <p>Further, Top Energy suggests that PER-3 is deleted and PER-2 relied on for both inside</p>	Insert new point and amend PER 1 of Rule NFL-R3, amend PER-2 of Rule NFL-R3, and delete PER-3 of Rule NFL-R3 as follows (or to the same effect):		Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				and outside of the coastal environment noting that in both instances NFL-S3 is referenced.	<p>The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:</p> <p>1.required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance-: or</p> <p>2.required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines-: or</p> <p>3.necessary to address a risk to public health and safety-: or</p> <p>4.for biosecurity reasons-: or</p> <p>5.for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori-: or</p> <p><b>6.Required for the upgrade of network utilities where the works are permitted under NF-RX PER-2</b></p> <p>The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance <b>is inside or</b> outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3</p> <p><del>The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance to provide for earthworks and vegetation clearance associated with upgrading of infrastructure.</del></p>			
FS346.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are not standards associated with that rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
FS345.212	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				not standards associated with that rule.		in its submission (S483).	And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
S243.061	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class.</p> <p>More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</li> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:<del>1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.</del></p> <p><b>1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:</b>1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks.</p> <p>2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines.</p> <p>3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety.</p> <p>4. for biosecurity reasons.</p> <p>5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>thinned to release new plantings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission.</p> <p>As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary</p>	<p><b>vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road.</b></p> <p><b>PER-2</b> Except as permitted under <b>PER-1</b>, <del>the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3</del> <b>PER-1</b> but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance <b>PER-3</b> <b>Except as permitted under PER-1</b> <del>the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3</del> <b>PER-1</b> but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule.</p> <p>Add a matter of discretion as follows:<b>1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:</b>a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally</p>		

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	<p><b>significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</b></p> <p>Add new clause as follows:<b>Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</b></p>			
<b>FS570.619</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>these.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class.</p> <p>More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</li> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings)</li> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is</p>				

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission.</p> <p>As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>				
FS566.633	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class.</p> <p>More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</li> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings)</li> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission.</p> <p>As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>				
FS569.655	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class.</p> <p>More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people)</li> <li>- Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities).</li> <li>- Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings)</li> <li>- Maintenance of driveways and roads.</li> </ul> <p>The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity.</p>			



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</li> <li>- Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.</li> </ul> <p>The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission.</p> <p>As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.</p>			
<b>S243.062</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	<p>Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere.</p> <p>This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established</p>	<p>Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan)</p> <p>Or, in the alternative,</p> <p>Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes.</p> <p>The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation.</p> <p>The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.</p> <p>As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above.</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.				
<b>FS570.620</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	<p>Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere.</p> <p>This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.</p> <p>While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes.</p> <p>The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation.</p> <p>The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.17</p> <p>Key Issue 17: NFL-R1</p> <p>And</p> <p>Section 6.2.19</p> <p>Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.</p> <p>As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above.</p> <p>If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.</p>				
FS566.634	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere.</p> <p>This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.</p> <p>While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district,</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes.</p> <p>The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation.</p> <p>The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.</p> <p>As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above.</p> <p>If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.</p>				
<b>FS569.656</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes.</p> <p>The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation.</p> <p>The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.</p> <p>As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the</p>				<p>Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.				
<b>S442.100</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL -R3 in first instance. Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>FS346.711</b>	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	Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3
<b>S67.031</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.854</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS566.080</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S67.032</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R4	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.855</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.081</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S277.019</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-R5	Oppose	I oppose the discretionary rule applying to plantation forestry and associated activities because our ruminant agriculture is under climate change pressures to switch land use into carbon sequestration and this rule will	Amend Rule NFL-R5 to remove discretionary activity status. To the extent that any resource consents are required in this context, the consent status should be restricted discretionary, with discretion restricted to effects only on natural features and landscape values.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				add complexity and expense to this desired land use change. There is no justification for an unlimited discretionary activity consent status to be required in this specialised context, far exceeding the objective as set out in NFL-O2.				
<b>S148.028</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	NFL-R5	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.	Delete NFL-R5		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS85.24</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS346.534</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS566.140</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>S160.023</b>	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule NFL-R5 Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activity and considers that a discretionary activity status is onerous and does not allow for this activity on rural production land in an ONL and ONF to be established.	Delete rule NFL-R5 Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activity.		Accept in part	Accept in part

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS85.25	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
FS346.593	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports Manulife submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
S495.013	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R5	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R5		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.				
<b>FS85.26</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS410.013</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS393.029</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.				
<b>S67.033</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R5	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS346.856</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>FS566.082</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules – General And Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>S91.011</b>	PF Olsen Limited	NFL-R5	Oppose	There is no provision for non-complying activities under the Natural and Built Environments Bill.	Delete Rule NFL-R5; and Insert permitted activity status to existing plantation forests and associated plantation forest activities.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted. Plantation forestry is a long term land use, with considerable financial inputs decades before any financial benefits are realised. To remove certainty of harvest and the ability to undertake other plantation forest activities does not give effect to the objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan, including Objectives NFL-02, RPROZ-01, RPROZ-03, RPROZ-04 and policies RPROZ-P1.</p> <p>Limited earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance are provided for other primary production industries but there is no provision for any plantation forestry activities. This is unjustified and inequitable. No justification has been provided for the inclusion of more stringent rules for plantation forestry. Just because regulation 6 of the NES-PF enables this, that in itself is not justification.</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Regulation 12 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forests already requires afforestation within an outstanding natural feature or landscape to obtain consent as a restricted discretionary activity.				
<b>FS566.100</b>	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	Section 6.2.20 Key Issue 20: NFL-R5
<b>S277.020</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-R6	Oppose	I oppose the discretionary status applied to farming in this area - this is farmland and it is farming that has been the guardian of this ONF. Without farming it wouldn't be the fascinating landform that it is. I oppose this restrictive rule also because it impacts 270ha of our land and would cause unreasonable regulatory complexity and cost to our family business. Good fences and water systems ensure livestock can be managed without causing the accelerated erosion associated with treading damage from livestock walking between grass and water. Good farm management will preserve and enhance the area.	Delete rule NFL-R6 and make farming a permitted activity.		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S421.159</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R6	Oppose	Federated Farmers does not support the rule and the activity classification that it has. It is illogical for the Council to require farmers to gain a resource consent if they	Delete Rule NFL-R6		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>are farming within an outstanding natural landscape or feature that is located outside of the coastal environment.</p> <p>Many farmers have existing operations which have occurred over decades with no more than minor effects on the surrounding environment. For many landowners the resource consent process will be too costly to make their operation economically viable.</p> <p>The rule as proposed is inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991. It is inappropriate as many outstanding natural landscapes and features are located in rural areas where the rural landscape adds to their value. Farming operations assist in the maintenance and protection of outstanding natural landscapes and features.</p> <p>It is felt that the Council is overreaching its functions under the Act through stating farming is inappropriate land use within the defined areas. It is not appropriate to try and retrofit a consenting framework through a proposed district plan for an activity which has been operating legally within the specified environments. Federated Farmers does not support the proposed requirement that farming as an activity will</p>			



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				require resource consent moving forward. We also do not support relying on existing use rights as this does not provide any clarity for landowners and Council. A reliance on existing use rights typically results in expensive discussions to establish what is included under an existing use right if one exists. Federated Farmers holds the view that existing use rights are for the same scale and character which is very hard to define for farming activities.				
<b>FS24.21</b>	Lynley Newport		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS143.57</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS143.62</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS196.163</b>	Joe Carr		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.				
<b>FS66.108</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS570.1391</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS346.393</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS566.1405</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS569.1427</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report	
S159.063	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R6	Oppose	There should be provision for rural production activities as a permitted activity. Rule NFL-R6 should give effect to NFL-P4.	Amend Rule NFL-R6, also including a permitted activity threshold as follows: NFL-R6 <del>Farming</del> <b>Rural Production</b> <b>PER-1 The activity is existing lawfully established rural production activity</b> Insert - <b>Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 - Restricted discretionary</b> Delete <del>DIS-1 - The farming activity and is located outside the coastal environment.</del> Delete non-complying status relating to DIS-1.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6	
FS151.228	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6	
FS346.011	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
FS570.225	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
FS566.239	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
FS569.261	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
S198.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes NFL-R6 and contends that making any kind of farming within an ONL or ONF a discretionary activity is unjustified,	Delete NRL-R6 or alternatively Amend NRL-R6 activity status to restricted discretionary and the matters of discretion should be related to the matters listed in NFL-P4	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6	

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				unacceptable and unreasonable.				
<b>FS66.106</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS66.107</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS332.221</b>	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S502.040</b>	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R6	Oppose	Changes are sought to remove the restriction on farming activities within an area of ONL and ONF. Under this rule, if the location is within an ONL or ONF and is located within the coastal environment, then any farming activity will be a non-complying activity. This contradicts Policy NFL-P4 which stipulates that farming	Delete NFL-R6 (inferred)		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				activities can be provided for within ONL and ONF where there is no compromise to any identified characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF. It is considered that farming activities should be a permitted activity within and outside of the coastal environment.				
<b>FS66.109</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S503.022</b>	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R6	Not Stated	Changes are sought to remove the restriction on farming activities with an area of ONL and ONF. Under this rule, if the location is within an ONL or ONF and is located within the coastal environment, then any farming activity will be a non-complying activity. This contradicts Policy NFL-P4 which stipulates providing for farming activities within ONL and ONF where there is no compromise to any identified characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF. It is considered that farming activities should be a permitted activity within and outside of the coastal environment.	Delete Rule NFL-R6 (inferred)		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS66.110	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
S96.001	Lynley Newport	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter considers it unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity. The submitter also considers the rule to be inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which provides for farming activities within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Delete NFL-R6 or amend activity status to restricted discretionary with the matters of discretion related to the matters listed in NFL-P4, i.e whether the activity will form part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; whether the activity is consistent with and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
FS28.025	Dr John L Craig		Support	<p>The submitter agrees it is unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an ONF and ONL and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity.</p> <p>The submitter wishes to restore vegetation across the majority of their property using a range of native species and on-going pest control. The proposed FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require</p>	Allow	Delete NFL-R6 or amend activity status to to restricted discretionary with the matters of discretion related to the matters listed in NFL-P4.	Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				resource consents for future activities.				
<b>FS548.022</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	<p>The submitter agrees it is unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an ONF and ONL and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity.</p> <p>The submitter wishes to restore vegetation across the majority of their property using a range of native species and on-going pest control. The proposed FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities.</p>	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>S495.014</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R6		Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS410.014</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.				
<b>S67.034</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R6	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Reject	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS346.857</b>	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	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6
<b>FS566.083</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S495.015</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R7	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R7		Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS410.015</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS393.030</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.</p>				
<b>S511.082</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NFL-R7	Oppose	<p>Forest &amp; Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.</p>	Delete Rule NFL-R7		Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS164.082</b>	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	<p>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</p>	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>		SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).		
<b>FS570.1653</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS566.1667</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
FS569.1689	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S442.101</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-R7	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Delete Rule NFL-R7.		Reject	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS346.712</b>	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	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>S67.035</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R7	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>FS346.858</b>	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	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS566.084</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.22 Key Issue 22: NFL-R7
<b>S67.036</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R8	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.859</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.085</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S67.037</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-R9	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.860</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.086</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S345.012</b>	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Standards	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.2 Key Issue 2: Mataka Station submissions Addressed in Hearing 19

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis.</p> <p>The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.</p>			
<b>S425.036</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Standards	Support in part	<p>PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.</p>	<p>Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.</p>	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.6 Key Issue 6: Objectives And Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards</p>
<b>S179.079</b>	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Standards	Support	<p>In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township.</p> <p>It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.</p>	Retain standards	Accept in part	<p>Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards</p>



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS51.99	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS23.042	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S97.001	Lynley Newport	NFL-S1	Support in part	The submitter considers that the 5m maximum height in NFL-S1 could be increased to 6m without increasing the risk of visual impact. The submitter also considers that the wording of the remainder of the standard in #1 is too open to interpretation.	Amend NFL-S1 to read: 1. The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is 6m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula within or adjacent to the property. Amend NFL-S1 2. similarly.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S277.021	Alec Jack	NFL-S1	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 &3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S333.038	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures).	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.			
<b>S497.003</b>	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-S1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S168.046</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S494.003</b>	Ian Jepson	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.			
<b>S187.038</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	<p>The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1.</p> <p>The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures).</p> <p>The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.</p>	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S222.048</b>	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	<p>The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1.</p> <p>The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the</p>	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.				
<b>S167.045</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS143.17</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in all instances and, as is the case at Mataka Station has been already assessed and determined at by the subdivision consent stage.	Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS566.407</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in all instances and, as is the case at Mataka Station has been already assessed and determined at by the subdivision consent stage.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S493.003</b>	William Goodfellow	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS67.112</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS68.110</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S496.002</b>	Philip Thornton	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	Section 6.2.23

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.				Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS411.002</b>	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S495.004</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-S1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity.	Delete NFL-S1 (inferred).		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS410.004</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.				
<b>S243.063</b>	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS570.621</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.				
<b>FS566.635</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS569.657</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.				
<b>S67.038</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-S1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.861</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.087</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S277.022</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-S2	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 & 3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.			
<b>S333.039</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S497.004</b>	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-S2	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S168.047</b>	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S494.005</b>	Ian Jepson	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.			
S187.039	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S222.049	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S502.041	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. An example of this is Coloursteel Sandstone Grey, which is a very common colour used and has an LRV of 27% but is not listed within the BS5252 colour range. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour palette range. The Resene	Amend NFL-S2 The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a <b>light</b> reflectance value no greater than 30%. <del>2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette</del> or in the event this relief is not accepted we ask that Council make the following changes - 2. <b>If painted</b> have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or equivalent product</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is therefore outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilised. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%, the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue). Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilized which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.</p>			
S503.023	Waitangi Limited	NFL-S2	Not Stated	<p>Reference to the BS5252 standard colour range has been removed. Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. An example of this is Coloursteel Sandstone Grey, which is a very common colour used and has an LRV of 27% but is not listed within the BS5252 colour range. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour</p>	<p>Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a <b>light</b> reflectance value no greater than 30%.</li> <li>2. <del>have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette.</del></li> </ol> <p>In the event that the above relief is not accepted we ask that Council make the following changes to point 2 (inferred): <b>If painted</b>, have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or equivalent product</b></p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>palette range. The Resene BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is therefore very outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilized. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%, the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue). Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilized which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.</p>				
FS51.36	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	<p>The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA.</p> <p>As a National Landmark, HNZPT advises that the planning framework applied to the extent of the Landmark site definition (as identified in the Landmark document Listing - Te Pitowhenua Waitangi Treaty Grounds documents 2019.pdf - All</p>	Disallow in part		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Documents (sharepoint.com) must strongly support the retention and protection of the heritage resources and the heritage values of the place.</p> <p>The management of buildings and structures within the Waitangi Treaty Grounds, and the impact the exterior of buildings and structures must be strictly controlled to ensure the protection of the place's significant heritage values of the Treaty Grounds. Some of which are viewed from the wider setting and viewpoints, such as from Kororareka Russell.</p> <p>However, HNZPT is supportive of proving greater flexibility of the source of the paint through the introduction of the proposed wording "or equivalent product".</p>			
<b>S167.046</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	<p>Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%.</li> <li>2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b></li> </ol>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS143.18</b>	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The relief sought that buildings can be also be natural finish stone or timber is supported as both are appropriate in coastal landscapes with high values.	Allow in part	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.408	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The relief sought that buildings can be also be natural finish stone or timber is supported as both are appropriate in coastal landscapes with high values.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S493.005	William Goodfellow	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS67.114	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S159.064	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-S2	Oppose	This standard would limit colour of cloth used in orchards.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 to include: <b>artificial crop protection structures are either dark green or black</b>		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS151.229	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS570.226	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
						inconsistent with our original submission		
<b>FS566.240</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS569.262</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S496.004</b>	Philip Thornton	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS411.004</b>	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S495.005</b>	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with	Delete Standard NFL-S2 (inferred).		Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards



Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity				
FS410.005	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S243.064	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette <b>or are a natural finish stone or timber.</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS570.622	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>FS566.636</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS569.658</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S67.039</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-S2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.862</b>	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	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS566.088</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S277.023</b>	Alec Jack	NFL-S3	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 & 3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.			
S333.040	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S3	Support in part	<p>Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m2).</p> <p>Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application.</p> <p>Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which</p>	<p>Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. not exceed a total area of 50m2 <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year; and</b></li> <li>2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m.</b>; and</li> <li>3. screen any exposed faces visible <del>from a public place.</del>; or</li> <li>4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform.</li> </ol> <p>Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S168.048	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	<p>includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.</p> <p>Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p>Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application.</p> <p>Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks.</p> <p>Screening should only be from public places (which includes</p>	<p>Amend standard NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. not exceed a total area of 50m<sup>2</sup> <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year</b>; and</li> <li>2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m.</b>; and</li> <li>3. screen any exposed faces <b>visible from a public place</b>; or ...</li> </ol>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.			
S187.040	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S3	Support	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m2); earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted; life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season after earthworks; and screening should only be from public places.	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m2 <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year</b> ; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m.</b> ; and 3. screen any exposed faces <b>visible from a public place.</b> ; or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S222.050	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m2). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m2 <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year</b> ; <b>and</b> 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m.</b> ; <b>and</b> 3. screen any exposed faces <b>visible from a public place.</b> ; <b>or</b> 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.		
S503.024	Waitangi Limited	NFL-S3	Not Stated	Under the Proposed Plan, any site not within the ONL, ONF or coastal environment overlay, as a permitted activity can undertake an earthworks activity over an area of 2500m <sup>2</sup> , which is significantly greater than the 50m <sup>2</sup> provided for over 10 years from the notification of the District Plan. 50m <sup>2</sup> of earthworks over 10 years is very restrictive and with the changes being made to the definition of earthworks likely to trigger consent for a number of activities, including repair and maintenance activities not already covered under NFL-R2. It is considered more appropriate to allow 100m <sup>2</sup> of earthworks per calendar year for sites within	Amend Standard NFL-S3 as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. not exceed a total area of 50m<sup>2</sup> over the life of the District Plan <b>100 m<sup>2</sup> per calendar year.</b></li> <li>2. ...</li> <li>3. ..</li> <li>4. be for the purpose of <b>establishing or maintaining an</b> access and/or a building platform, <b>or undertaking repair and maintenance activities which are not covered by NFL-R2.</b></li> </ol> <p>We seek clarification that where mentioned that these activities only relate to historic items as general</p>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				the ONF and ONL overlay. This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 100m <sup>2</sup> area. The provision for 100m <sup>2</sup> of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the ONF and ONL overlay are adhered to.	repair and maintenance activities can generate some small scale earthworks		
S167.047	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m <sup>2</sup> <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year; and</b> 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m.; and</b> 3. screen any exposed faces <b>visible from a public place.; or</b> 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
FS143.19	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely	Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.				
<b>FS534.042</b>	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.	Allow	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS566.409</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S511.085</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NFL-S3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL-S3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS164.085</b>	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	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	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS548.165</b>	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS570.1656</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	<p>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</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>				
<b>FS566.1670</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS569.1692</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	<p>Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as</p>	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>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.</p> <p>The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.</p>			
S502.042	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	<p>Under the Proposed Plan, any site not within the ONL, ONF or coastal environment overlay, as a permitted activity can undertake an earthworks activity over an area of 2500m<sup>2</sup>, which is significantly greater than the 50m<sup>2</sup> provided for over 10 years from the notification of the District Plan.</p> <p>50m<sup>2</sup> of earthworks over 10 years is very restrictive and with the changes being made to the definition of earthworks likely to trigger consent for a number of activities, including repair and maintenance activities not already covered under NFL-R2. It is considered more appropriate to allow 100m<sup>2</sup> of earthworks per calendar year for sites within the ONF and ONL overlay.</p>	<p>Amend NFL-S3 Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not exceed a total area of 50m<sup>2</sup> <del>over the life of the District Plan</del> <b>100 m<sup>2</sup> per calendar year</b></li> <li>2. Not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1m</li> <li>3. Screen any exposed faces</li> <li>4. Be for the purpose of <b>establishing or maintaining an</b> access and/or building platform, <b>or undertaking repair and maintenance activities which are not covered by NFL-R2.</b></li> </ol>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 100m <sup>2</sup> area. The provision for 100m <sup>2</sup> of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the ONF and ONL overlay are adhered to. 2.13. Again with repair and maintenance we seek clarification that where mentioned that these activities only relate to historic items as general repair and maintenance activities can generate some small scale earthworks.				
FS354.127	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The amendment provides for a more reasonable amount of earthworks to be undertaken.	Allow	Allow S502.042	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
S243.065	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m <sup>2</sup> ). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m <sup>2</sup> <del>over the life of the District Plan.</del> <b>per calendar year; and</b> 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of <del>4m</del> <b>1.5m;</b> <b>and</b> 3. screen any exposed faces <b>visible from a public place;</b> or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply</p>	<p>respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.</p>			
<p><b>FS570.623</b></p>	<p>Vision Kerikeri 3</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards</p>

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply</p>				
FS566.637	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application.</p> <p>Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks.</p> <p>Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply</p>				
<b>FS569.659</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply				
<b>S442.104</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-S3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL-S3 in first instance, Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the OB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>FS346.715</b>	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	Reject	Section 6.2.23 Key Issue 23: Standards
<b>S67.040</b>	Michael John Winch	NFL-S3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS346.863</b>	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	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				
<b>FS566.089</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	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.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S333.053</b>	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature <b>(where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots				
<b>S187.053</b>	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature <b>(where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay).</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
<b>S364.059</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R18	Support	The Director-General supports the activity status associated with Rule SUB-R18	Retain Rule SUB-R18		Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
<b>FS372.004</b>	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	retain the rules as proposed	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
<b>FS570.1140</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS346.199	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
FS566.1154	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
FS569.1176	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
S222.054	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature <b>(where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.</p>				
<p><b>FS405.041</b></p>	<p>Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>Ballantyne &amp; Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.</p>	<p>Allow</p>	<p>allow the original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18</p>
<p><b>FS361.033</b></p>	<p>Willowridge Developments Limited</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>Ballantyne &amp; Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.</p>	<p>Allow</p>	<p>Allow the original submission</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18</p>

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
S243.078	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature <b>(where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)</b>		Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
FS570.636	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots</p>				
<b>FS566.650</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	<p>On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots</p>				
<b>FS569.672</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	<p>On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions</p>	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots			
<b>S167.060</b>	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole.	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature <b>(where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)</b>	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
<b>FS566.422</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.24 Key Issue 24: SUB-R18
<b>S282.027</b>	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Rules	Oppose	The current rules framework in relation to Natural features and landscapes does not provide for new infrastructure activities noting that in instances there may be a functional or operational need for such activities to be located in Natural Character areas. Allowing for new infrastructure (compliant with the relevant standards within the Infrastructure section) within	Amend rules to allow for new infrastructure to be established within road reserve when located within an ONL and ONF.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				existing road reserve would appear appropriate given the land has already been developed and therefore has a lesser degree of impact in these areas.				
<b>FS36.056</b>	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	The submitter agrees that the natural features and landscapes provisions need to provide for new infrastructure activities where there is an operational and/or functional need. Waka Kotahi notes that infrastructure/transport corridors often provide vital lifeline access to communities and sometimes roads have a functional need to be located in these areas.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>FS111.085</b>	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	The submitter agrees that the natural features and landscapes provisions need to provide for new infrastructure activities where there is an operational and/or functional need. Waka Kotahi notes that infrastructure/transport corridors often provide vital lifeline access to communities and sometimes roads have a functional need to be located in these areas.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S216.002</b>	Errol McIntyre	Rules	Oppose	Opposes all controls over private land because it infringes on a right to own property. Should an authority control land use, then some form of compensation is in order. Any areas set aside as ONL or ONF should at the very least be void of rates.	Council should waive rates on all areas of significant natural landscapes/areas (ONL or ONF) that the Proposed District Plan refers to.		Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				Why should a landowner pay rates on land they can no longer use and is there for the public good?				
<b>FS541.004</b>	Errol James McIntyre		Support	outstanding and significant areas are protected by law for all. the landowner should not be paying rates on such land	Allow	Council should consider areas of significance protected by RM, be exempt from rates	Reject	Section 6.2.15 Key Issue 15: Rules - General
<b>S364.078</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHE5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS570.1159</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS346.218</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS566.1173</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS569.1195</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.		consistent with our original submission		Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S364.079</b>	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS570.1160</b>	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS346.219</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS566.1174</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS569.1196</b>	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S277.024</b>	Alec Jack	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Jacks Lake is not a natural feature - it is man-made and was created by Ned Jack with financial assistance (50% subsidy for habitat creation) from the Acclimatization Society (now Fish and Game NZ) in 1975. I will provide multiple levels of evidence at the hearings stage. I also oppose the inclusion of our land immediately adjacent to Lake Owhareiti in the ONF91 classification. Lake Owhareiti itself dictates its boundary, not a land title, or a line on a map. The farmland adjacent to the lake isn't an outstanding natural feature.	Amend the Planning Maps to exclude Jacks Lake, and Lake Owhareiti foreshore area on our farm from area classified "ONF91 Pouerua (Pakaraka Mountain) scoria cone, lava field and lava-dammed lakes".	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S420.007</b>	Muriwhenua Incorporated	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S91.013</b>	PF Olsen Limited	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Feature, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Features overlay mapping.	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				activities should also be permitted.				
<b>FS108.21</b>	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS566.102</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S148.031</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONF overlay mapping		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS85.51</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.				
<b>FS85.54</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS346.537</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.				
<b>FS566.143</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S242.002</b>	Zejia Hu	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506). The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that: a. constructing a dwelling and undertaking other customary associated activities, and b. undertaking Farming activities  on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and those areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission. The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay. The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays. Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3. Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being</p>	<p>permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and unreasonable burden on the landowner.</p>		<p>Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6</p>



**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>categorised as 'Non-Complying'!</p> <p>As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B).</p> <p>In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the environment or any person significantly.</p> <p>The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules). With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe.</p> <p>There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
<b>S75.001</b>	Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: -Several kilometres of roading in place -Acres of land clearance -Buildings insitu -Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	Delete Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S497.002</b>	Mark John Wyborn	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the ONL overlay be removed from that part of the submitter's property [illustrated in the submission] that do not have these qualities such that the submitter can continue to use and develop his land in a manner consistent with its current residential use.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Orokawa 3C 2A Block NA17A/1419 (187A Manawaora Road, Russell) [as illustrated in submission].	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S242.001</b>	Zeija Hu	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506). The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that:  a. constructing a dwelling and undertaking other customary associated activities, and b. undertaking Farming activities on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays And Section 6.2.17 Key Issue 17: NFL-R1 And Section 6.2.19 Key Issue 19: NFL-R3 And Section 6.2.21 Key Issue 21: NFL-R6

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>those areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission.</p> <p>The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay.</p> <p>The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays.</p> <p>Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3.</p> <p>Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being categorised as 'Non-Complying'!</p> <p>As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is</p>	<p>unreasonable burden on the landowner.</p>		

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B).                      In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the environment or any person significantly.                      The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules).                      With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe.                      There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These</p>			

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.</p>			
S494.001	Ian Jepson	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	<p>Lot 3 DP 48494 has imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays appear to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and do not reflect the state of the</p>	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Lot 3 DP 48494.	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings, extensive lawns, outbuildings and roading. The majority of the site is devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.			
<b>S353.002</b>	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Support	<p>The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land;</li> <li>- the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and</li> <li>- the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.</li> </ul>	Retain parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscape which applies to NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP 197131). If the primary relief above is not proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be appropriately developed.	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S491.002</b>	Eric Kloet	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) is a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds. The area enjoys an attractive	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213)	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				<p>aesthetic, but due to the predominantly human landscape qualities exhibited by the specific property and others within close proximity, which include significant buildings and infrastructure as well as roading it cannot be considered to meet the high bar of having the landscape values ascribed to it over the whole of the subject site. The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained. Therefore, the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with the present planning regimen.</p>			
<b>S490.002</b>	Owen Burn	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	<p>The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay is inappropriate and impose unduly restrictive controls on the reasonable use and development of the site and adjacent land. The high natural character overlay does not reflect the existing state of the subject property or the surrounding land, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within</p>	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay (identified in the submission)	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays



## Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				extensively developed and landscaped grounds			
<b>S492.002</b>	Ironwood Trust Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission) does not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing buildings and other domestic infrastructure with the majority of the land not having qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission)	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S420.009</b>	Muriwhenua Incorporated	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S493.001</b>	William Goodfellow	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	In particular the submitter considers that these overlays do not reflect the state of the subject property or the surrounding land as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape. In particular much	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from parcels on Rawhiti Road, Rawhiti (identified in the submission).	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				of the land holding to the east of Rawhiti Road is given over to plantation forestry which has been recently harvested. In addition, land to the west of this road has recently been subdivided such that it will ultimately be developed for residential use. Accordingly, and as is evident from the aerial photograph below, the majority of the land is in reality devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.				
<b>FS67.110</b>	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS68.108</b>	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of	Disallow		Accept	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.			
<b>S148.030</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONL overlay mapping	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS85.52</b>	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS85.53	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
FS346.536	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.				
<b>FS566.142</b>	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S91.012</b>	PF Olsen Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Landscape, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted.	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay mapping.		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS196.245</b>	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
FS566.101	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
S496.001	Philip Thornton	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The submitter considers that the ONL overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with its evident landscape characteristics.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Waipohutukawa Bay, Bay of Islands (Lot 4 DP 391213) [as illustrated in submission].		Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
FS411.001	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
S495.002	Ricky Faesen Kloet	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The overlay appears to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and does not reflect the environment of the western end of Motuarohia Island and the subject property in particular. This part of Motuarohia Island is largely developed with holiday homes with domestic infrastructure. While these sites contain stands of bush these are discontinuous and do not create a coherent natural landscape unit. When considered in its entirety it does not exhibit the landscape qualities that could not reasonably be described as	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from Lot 6 DP 488661, Motuarohia Island.		Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
				having high natural character. The overlay is inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.				
<b>FS410.002</b>	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>S148.053</b>	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from plantation forest areas		Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
<b>FS346.559</b>	Royal Forest and Bird		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25

**Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table**

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of s42A report
	Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.			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.				Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays
FS566.165	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 6.2.25 Key Issue 25: ONL and ONF overlays