

Appendix 2 – Officer's Recommended Decisions on Submissions – Officers Written Reply (Public Access)

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S559.040	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The proposed amendment will support objective TW-O4.	Amend Public Access provisions to transfer applicable esplanade strips to hapū (inferred).		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS151.348	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS570.2230	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS348.067	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS566.2244	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	Section 5.2.5

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
						consistent with our original submission		Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS569.2266	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
S436.030	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	<p>The recreational values of waterbodies can be constrained by limited public access; therefore, it is important to provide such access. Rivers and streams in the Far North District support trout fisheries, and many wetlands support game bird hunting, but outside of urban areas there is relatively little legal public access to and along waterbodies. While unformed legal roads do provide some access to rivers, they often wander over farmland and it is not obvious where they lie. Once at the river, there are few esplanade reserves and strips, marginal strips, recreation and road reserves and so most riverbanks are in private ownership, potentially with ad medium filum rights.</p> <p>Fish and Game has a statutory obligation to maintain and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas. Public access to lakes, rivers and public spaces can be fragmented by the subdivision process if not carefully managed. The subdivision process itself however provides an opportunity to maintain public access and associated linkages. The recreation of esplanade reserves for example can provide for the</p>	<p>Retain policies and rules that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure that the plan maintains and enhances public access to and along wetlands, streams, lakes and rivers - provide for the creation and protection of esplanade reserves and strips as a permitted activity. 	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)	

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 of conservation values of riparian margins, maintenance of water quality and aquatic habitats and the enhancement of public access and recreational opportunities, including sports fish angling and game bird hunting. Section 6(d) of the RMA recognises that the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes and rivers is a matter of national importance				
FS570.1494	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.116	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA and the NPS IB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission of Fish and Game other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1508	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1530	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
S421.160	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	The District Plan needs to be clear that access is not available across private land unless it is with permission from the landowner. The landowner should not be compelled by the District Plan to always provide access across what is essentially their business and home. Many rural landowners, particularly coastal or riparian margin landowners, have encounters with unwelcome trespassers, some with dogs, that are disruptive to their farming operations, create security issues for themselves and their stock, have put themselves into dangerous situations, or created nuisance effects like littering or human waste. It is appropriate and legal to limit access across private property when this access will be unsafe or will disrupt farming activities, such as when tree felling or earthmoving is occurring, or during harvest or lambing activities.	Amend the Overview so that it addresses the issue of public access across private property and the need to ensure that this access is provided with the agreement of the landowner where it is practicable to provide that access		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue: Private property rights
FS196.162	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko nui	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue: Private property rights
FS570.1392	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue: Private property rights
FS346.394	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue: Private property rights

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1406	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 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS569.1428	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue: Private property rights
S445.015	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS95.002	Northland Fish and Game Council		Support	Support the proposed amendments which can provide for the protection of conservation values of riparian margins, maintenance of water quality and aquatic habitats and the enhancement of public access and recreational opportunities, including sports fish angling and game bird hunting.	Allow	Retain the amendments sought (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.086	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Oppose	PHTTCCT do not support the waiving of esplanade requirements as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1770	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.1749	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S523.019	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Objectives	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS88.61	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs. A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1813	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S559.046	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	Objectives	Support in part	Ngāti Rēhia are the kaitiaki of the water resources within our rohe.	Insert an objective into the PDP that focuses on the relationship of tangata whenua to their ancestral waterways and the maintenance of that relationship.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS151.355	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS570.2236	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS348.073	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part (insofar as the original submission point is recommended to be rejected)	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS566.2250	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.2272	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
S421.163	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Objectives	Support in part	The landowner's private property rights are a key area of focus which needs to be considered within this chapter.	Insert a new Objective as follows: Practical and safe public access to and along the margins of lakes and rivers and the coastal environment is provided in a way that respects private property and does not result in adverse effects on natural character, landscape, indigenous biodiversity, historical heritage, or cultural values. or wording with similar intent		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS196.159	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS25.063	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS325.039	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS570.1395	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 8: Private property rights
FS346.397	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS566.1409	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 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS569.1431	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
S272.017	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Objectives	Support in part	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.087	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)							reserves for land use applications
FS570.777	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.791	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS569.813	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S523.017	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Objectives	Support in part	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.088	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

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
	Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)							Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS277.52	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential to provide for environment and community	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS277.53	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment and community	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.1811	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S272.023	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Objectives	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values				
FS570.783	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS566.797	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS569.819	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S529.192	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Objectives	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.2079	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS566.2093	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS569.2115	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S445.017	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Objectives	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS569.1772	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

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
								Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS570.1751	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S421.161	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-O1	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives PA-O1 and PA-O2 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. However, there is a need for an additional objective to be included that provides recognition for private property rights as well as the additional impacts public access may also have on the amenity value of selected landscapes and areas.	Retain Objective PA-O1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.161	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS25.061	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS66.111	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The objectives generally balance public access benefits against private property rights, subject to the amendments as sought by the submitter.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS325.037	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1393	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.395	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1407	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1429	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S421.162	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-O2	Support	Federated Farmers supports objectives PA-O1 and PA-O2 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan. However, there is a need for an additional objective to be included that provides recognition for	Retain Objective PA-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				private property rights as well as the additional impacts public access may also have on the amenity value of selected landscapes and areas.				addressed elsewhere)
FS196.160	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS25.062	Kiwi Fresh Orange Company Limited		Support	Supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS325.038	Turnstone Trust Limited		Support	TT supports the submission, including the proposed amendment to reflect that there are some areas of public land adjoining waterbodies.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1394	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.396	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.1408	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1430	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S272.016	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS67.73	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS67.74	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

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
				the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.				Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS68.73	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS69.71	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS66.112	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.				
FS111.090	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS277.54	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment and community	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.776	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.790	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS569.812	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S529.186	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

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
				The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanade reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.				Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS67.75	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS68.74	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS69.72	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.				
FS66.113	Benzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.091	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.2073	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.2087	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS569.2109	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								reserves for land use applications
S529.187	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS67.76	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS68.75	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS69.73	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

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
				the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.				Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS66.114	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.092	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.2074	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.2088	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.2110	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S523.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS67.77	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS88.62	Stephanie Lane		Support in part	Please ensure these areas can also be used by people with dogs.	Allow in part		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

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
				A "dogs on leash" rule would be sufficient to keep fauna and flora safe.				Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS66.115	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS566.1814	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S523.018	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Policies	Support in part	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities. The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanades reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS68.76	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.				
FS69.74	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of land use and development and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.093	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS566.1812	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
S421.169	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Policies	Support in part	The policy section needs to include private property as a consideration when providing public access to ensure that it does not cause damage or create security risks. As a group, farmers provide more public access across their private property than other landowners (such as residential or industrial). Farmers are familiar with the adverse effects that result from public access such as rubbish, weed incursions and nuisance effects on	Insert a new Policy as follows: PA-P6 To provide information and education to the public regarding where public access is available, and that access over private land is only by the permission of the landowner or wording with similar intent		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				their homes and places of work. The provision of public access also provides for weed incursions which are of particular concern with Chilean Needle Grass and Yellow Bristle Grass now in the region, which can create significant damage to livestock welfare and pasture quality.				
FS196.153	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko. I am concerned that the public could be at risk from attack from a newly calved cow or a bull, especially if they have a dog	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS570.1401	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS346.403	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS566.1415	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 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
FS569.1437	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.8 Key issue 8: Private property rights
S445.016	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Not Stated	The PDP proposes only voluntary creation of esplanade reserves for land use activities.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1

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
				The s32 report (p.32) notes the cost of a voluntary approach: 'No requirements for esplanade reserves where lots greater than 4ha are created for land use activities... potentially misses opportunities for improved access to waterbodies and the coast'. This cost applies also in the case of smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.				Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS111.089	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS569.1771	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.1750	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications
FS570.1774	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.1 Key issue 1: Esplanade reserves for land use applications

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S272.024	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS570.784	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS566.798	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS569.820	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S529.193	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	Policies	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2

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
				indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values	as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values			Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS570.2080	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS566.2094	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS569.2116	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S445.018	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Support in part	In some situations esplanade can serve an important role in protecting ecological values and protecting indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System. s32 report (p.3) notes that policies to	Amend provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				protect riparian/coastal areas should not compromise the natural character or indigenous biodiversity. We consider that the PDP provisions relating to the protection of indigenous species are not sufficient at present. PDP provisions relating to esplanade and reserves need to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values				
FS569.1773	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
FS570.1752	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.2 Key issue 2: Protection of ecological values
S421.164	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-P1	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies PA-P1 to PA-5 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy PA-P1 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.158	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.1396	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.398	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1410	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1432	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S98.001	Lynley Newport	PA-P1	Support in part	The submitter supports that the Public Access chapter deals solely with objectives and policies and contains no rules and cross references to rules relating to public access in other chapters. The submitter considers that throughout the chapter any references to esplanade reserves need to be amended to include the words esplanade strips.	Amend PA-P1 to read as follows: Protect, maintain and enhance public and customary access by 2. requiring subdivision activities to provide esplanade reserves or strips along the coastal marine area and waterbodies; and		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key issue 7: Esplanade strips

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS66.116	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought by the submitter does not appropriately balance the costs of the provision of esplanade reserve to the land owner, applying as it does the requirement for esplanade reserves to apparently all forms and scale of subdivision and will be neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Reject	Section 5.2.7 Key issue 7: Esplanade strips
S272.001	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P1	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5 PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain PA-P1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS111.094	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.762	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
FS566.776	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.798	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S529.056	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P1	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5 PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain PA-P1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS111.095	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
FS570.1945	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1959	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1981	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S523.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P1	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council)	Retain PA-P1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)				
FS111.096	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1796	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S445.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P1	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in	Retain PA- P1		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)				
FS569.1756	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1736	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S98.002	Lynley Newport	PA-P2	Support in part	The submitter supports that the Public Access chapter deals solely with objectives and policies and contains no rules and cross references to rules relating to public access in other chapters. The submitter considers that throughout the chapter any references to esplanade reserves need to be amended to include the words esplanade strips.	Amend PA-P2 as follows: Require the creation of esplanade reserves or strips to and along the coastal marine area and waterbodies when considering an application for subdivision where it:		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key issue 7: Esplanade strips

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S333.041	P S Yates Family Trust	PA-P2	Oppose	<p>Policy PA-P2 sets out a number of circumstances at a.-g. where public access is required to be provided at subdivision. These do not align with the subdivision rules which implement this policy, where such circumstances are limited.</p> <p>The policy should integrate with the equivalent policy in the subdivision section (SUB- P7) so that the specific method for achieving the policy is specified in the rule rather than in the policy. For example, the obligation of policy PA-P2 to require the creation of esplanade reserves where it 'c. protects, maintains or enhances public access' goes beyond the limited circumstances specified in rule SUB-S8.</p>	Delete policy PA-P2 and replace with: " Require esplanade reserves or strips when subdividing to specified lot sizes land adjoining the coast and other qualifying water-bodies ".	Reject	<p>Section 5.2.6</p> <p>Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions</p>
S445.002	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P2	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) 	Retain PA-P2	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</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
				- 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)				
FS95.003	Northland Fish and Game Council		Support	Support retaining these provisions for the creation of esplanade reserves and strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.	Allow	Retain the provisions (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1757	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1737	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S559.041	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	PA-P2	Support in part	It is unclear by just saying cultural sites of significance and could be missed out by those required to implement the policy.	Amend PA-P2 to include mahinga kai purposes and fisheries.		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS151.349	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								relationship with water
FS151.350	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS570.2231	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS348.068	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS566.2245	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS569.2267	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
S421.165	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-P2	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies PA-P1 to PA-5 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy PA-P2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.157	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1397	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.399	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1411	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1433	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
S272.011	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P2	Support in part	<p>Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5</p> <p>PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.</p>	Retain PA-P2		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS111.097	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS570.771	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS566.785	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</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
FS569.807	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S529.180	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P2	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5	Retain PA-P2		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS111.098	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.2067	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.2081	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.2103	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
S523.011	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P2	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3) 	Retain PA-P2		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS111.099	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support the inclusion of requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</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
FS566.1805	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S167.048	Bentzen Farm Limited	PA-P2	Oppose	Policy PA-P2 does not align with the subdivision rules which implement this policy, where such circumstances are limited. The policy should integrate with the equivalent policy in the subdivision section (SUB- P7) so that the specific method for achieving the policy is specified in the rule rather than in the policy.	Delete policy PA-P2 and replace with: " Require esplanade reserves or strips when subdividing to specified lot sizes land adjoining the coast and other qualifying water-bodies ".		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS47.009	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS566.410	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
S168.049	Setar Thirty Six Limited	PA-P2	Oppose	Policy PA-P2 sets out a number of circumstances at a.-g. where public access is required to be provided at subdivision. These do not align with the subdivision rules which implement this policy, where such circumstances are limited. The policy should integrate with the equivalent policy in the subdivision section (SUB- P7) so that the specific	Delete policy PA-P2 and insert the following replacement: " Require esplanade reserves or strips when subdividing to specified lot sizes land adjoining the coast and other qualifying water-bodies ".		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				method for achieving the policy is specified in the rule rather than in the policy. For example, the obligation of policy PA-P2 to require the creation of esplanade reserves where it 'c. protects, maintains or enhances public access' goes beyond the limited circumstances specified in rule SUB-S8.				
FS47.0010	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS569.034	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose all these submissions because they seek to replace PA-P2 as drafted in the PDP with its criteria requiring the creation of Esplanade Reserves.	Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
S187.041	The Shooting Box Limited	PA-P2	Oppose	<p>Policy PA-P2 sets out a number of circumstances at a.-g. where public access is required to be provided at subdivision. These do not align with the subdivision rules which implement this policy, where such circumstances are limited.</p> <p>The policy should integrate with the equivalent policy in the subdivision section (SUB- P7) so that the specific method for achieving the policy is specified in the rule rather than in the policy. For example, the obligation of policy PA-P2 to require the creation of esplanade reserves where it 'c. protects, maintains or enhances public access'</p>	Delete policy PA-P2 and replace with: "Require esplanade reserves or strips when subdividing to specified lot sizes land adjoining the coast and other qualifying water-bodies" .		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				goes beyond the limited circumstances specified in rule SUB-S8.				
FS47.013	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS569.037	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	We oppose all these submissions because they seek to replace PA-P2 as drafted in the PDP with its criteria requiring the creation of Esplanade Reserves	Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2	Accept in part	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
S243.066	Matauri Trustee Limited	PA-P2	Oppose	Policy PA-P2 sets out a number of circumstances at a.g. where public access is required to be provided at subdivision. These do not align with the subdivision rules which implement this policy, where such circumstances are limited. The policy should integrate with the equivalent policy in the subdivision section (SUB- P7) so that the specific method for achieving the policy is specified in the rule rather than in the policy. For example, the obligation of policy PA-P2 to require the creation of esplanade reserves where it 'c. protects, maintains or enhances public access' goes beyond the limited circumstances specified in rule SUB-S8.	Delete policy PA-P2 and replace with: Require esplanade reserves or strips when subdividing to specified lot sizes land adjoining the coast and other qualifying water-bodies.		Reject	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS570.624	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 provisions
FS566.638	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 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
FS569.660	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.6 Key issue 6: Alignment with Subdivision provisions
S98.003	Lynley Newport	PA-P3	Support in part	The submitter supports that the Public Access chapter deals solely with objectives and policies and contains no rules and cross references to rules relating to public access in other chapters. The submitter considers that throughout the chapter any references to esplanade reserves need to be amended to include the words esplanade strips.	Amend PA-P3 to read as follows: Allow a waiver of any requirement or a reduction in the required width of an esplanade reserve or strip where it can be demonstrated that:		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key issue 7: Esplanade strips
S425.038	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	PA-P3	Support in part	As a general comment the waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported by PHTTCCT . However, if such a provision must be included it is sought that the wording is changed to make it clear that this should only occur in exceptional circumstances.	amend PA-P3 to read as follows: Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for , or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the area is not identified as esplanade priority , and it can be demonstrated that: a. safe and reasonable public access or recreational use already exists and can be maintained for the future, while considering the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, erosion and accretion; b. providing access will be detrimental to land and water-based habitats of indigenous		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					flora and fauna within, and adjoining the margin; c. providing access will be detrimental to any historic heritage place or site and area of significance to Māori; d. it would protect the stability, performance, maintenance and operation of essential structures and infrastructure; or restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.		
S446.019	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P3	Support in part	As a general comment the waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported. However, if such a provision must be included it is sought that the wording is changed to make it clear that this should only occur in exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, the following amendments are sought, noting the comment above I regards to mapping of esplanade priority.	Amend PA-P3 to allow Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for , or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the area is not identified as esplanade priority , and it can be demonstrated that: a. safe and reasonable public access or recreational use already exists and can be maintained for the future, while considering the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, erosion and accretion; b. providing access will be detrimental to land and water-based habitats of indigenous flora and fauna within, and adjoining the margin; c. providing access will be detrimental to any historic heritage place or site and area of significance to Māori; d. it would protect the stability, performance, maintenance and operation of essential structures and infrastructure; or e. restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS95.004	Northland Fish and Game Council		Support	Support the submission point that the waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported however if it is to be included it should be amended so as to only occur in exceptional circumstances.	Allow Amend, if necessary, to only provide a waiver of esplanade requirements in exceptional circumstances (inferred)	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
								Reserve Requirements
FS111.101	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT do not support the waiving of esplanade requirements as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS569.1778	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS570.1778	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
S559.042	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	PA-P3	Support in part	N/A	Amend PA-P3 to include where it is detrimental to land in Māori title, mahinga kai, and hapū fisheries.		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS151.351	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS570.2232	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS348.069	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose	The submission was not made by the closing date and is therefore not a valid submission under RMA	Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS566.2246	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
FS569.2268	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.5 Key issue 5: Tangata whenua relationship with water
S421.166	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-P3	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies PA-P1 to PA-5 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy PA-P3 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.156	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
FS66.117	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The policy as drafted is appropriate having regard to the objectives it implements.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1398	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.400	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1412	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1434	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S271.020	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P3	Oppose	The waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported. It is sought that the wording is changed to make it clear that exceptions should	Amend PA-P3 to allow a Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for , or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the area is not		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				only occur in exceptional circumstances.	<p>identified as esplanade priority, and it can be demonstrated that:</p> <p>a. safe and reasonable public access or recreational use already exists and can be maintained for the future, while considering the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, erosion and accretion;</p> <p>b. providing access will be detrimental to land and water-based habitats of indigenous flora and fauna within, and adjoining the margin;</p> <p>c. providing access will be detrimental to any historic heritage place or site and area of significance to Māori;</p> <p>d. it would protect the stability, performance, maintenance and operation of essential structures and infrastructure; or</p> <p>e. restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.</p>			Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS111.0100	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT do not support the waiving of esplanade requirements as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS570.743	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS566.757	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS569.779	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
S529.085	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P3	Oppose	The waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported. It is sought that the wording is changed to make it clear that exceptions should only occur in exceptional circumstances.	Amend PA-P3 to allow a Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for, or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the area is not identified as esplanade priority, and it can be demonstrated that: a. safe and reasonable public access or recreational use already exists and can be maintained for the future, while considering the potential effects of climate change, including sea level rise, erosion and accretion; b. providing access will be detrimental to land and water-based habitats of indigenous flora and fauna within, and adjoining the margin; c. providing access will be detrimental to any historic heritage place or site and area of significance to Māori; d. it would protect the stability, performance, maintenance and operation of essential structures and infrastructure; or e. restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS111.102	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail		Support	PHTTCCT do not support the waiving of esplanade requirements as there is	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
	Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)			always future potential for contributing to connectivity				Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS570.1973	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS566.1987	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS569.2009	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
S524.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P3	Oppose	The waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported. It is sought that the wording is changed to make it clear that exceptions should only occur in exceptional circumstances.	Amend PA-P3 to allow a Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for , or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the area is not identified as esplanade priority, and it can be demonstrated that:		Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
					land and water-based habitats of indigenous flora and fauna within, and adjoining the margin; c. providing access will be detrimental to any historic heritage place or site and area of significance to Māori; d. it would protect the stability, performance, maintenance and operation of essential structures and infrastructure; or e. restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.			
FS111.103	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support	PHTTCCT do not support the waiving of esplanade requirements as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity	Allow	allow original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
FS566.1838	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.4 Key issue 4: Waiving of Esplanade Reserve Requirements
S272.014	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P3	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5 PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the	Retain PA-P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.				
FS570.774	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.788	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.810	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S529.181	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P3	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5	Retain PA-P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.2068	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS566.2082	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.2104	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S523.012	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P3	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where 	Retain PA-P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)				
FS566.1806	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S445.003	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P3	Support	Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development. In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan. We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section): - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3)	Retain PA-P3		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1758	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1738	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S421.167	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-P4	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies PA-P1 to PA-5 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy PA-P4 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.155	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1399	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.401	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1413	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1435	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S272.015	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P4	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5 PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain PA-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.775	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
FS566.789	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.811	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S529.182	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P4	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5	Retain PA-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.2069	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.2083	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.2105	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S523.013	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P4	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways.</p> <p>This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3) 	Retain PA-P4		Accept	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS566.1807	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</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
S445.004	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P4	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3) 	Retain PA-P4		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1759	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1739	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S98.004	Lynley Newport	PA-P5	Support in part	The submitter supports that the Public Access chapter deals solely with objectives and policies and contains no rules and cross references to rules relating to public access in other chapters. The submitter considers that throughout the chapter any references to esplanade reserves need to be amended to include the words esplanade strips.	Amend PA-P5 as follows: Encourage the voluntary creation of esplanade reserves or strips for land use activities where it		Accept	Section 5.2.7 Key issue 7: Esplanade strips
S421.168	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PA-P5	Support	Federated Farmers supports policies PA-P1 to PA-5 as they are currently drafted in the proposed district plan.	Retain Policy PA-P5 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS196.154	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1400	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submissions.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS346.402	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.				addressed elsewhere)
FS566.1414	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1436	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S272.012	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P5	Support in part	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5 PDP policies/rules should require esplanade reserves/strips when subdivision creates lots of 4ha or more. PDP provisions that normally require esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development. Improve provisions relating to the esplanade reserves to include clauses that will actively protect indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.	Retain PA-P5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.772	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not

Proposed Far North District Plan – 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 elsewhere)
FS566.786	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.808	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S529.183	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P5	Support	Support PDP policies and rules that require the creation of esplanade reserves associated with subdivision. In particular we support - Public access policies PA-P1 to PA-P5	Retain PA-P5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.2070	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS566.2084	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.2106	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S523.014	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P5	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways.</p> <p>This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3) 	Retain PA-P5		Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</p>
FS566.1808	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	<p>Section 5.2.9</p> <p>Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)</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
S445.005	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P5	Support	<p>Our group supports policies and rules that will require the creation of esplanade reserves/strips along the coast and water bodies when consents are granted for subdivision, land use and other forms of development.</p> <p>In addition to the important principles of public access, there is increasing need to provide much greater connectivity and options for active transport, especially walkways and cycleways. This places new importance on acquiring esplanade reserves/strips in suitable locations within the lifetime of the proposed district plan.</p> <p>We support the following statements in the s32 report on public access (management approach section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Far North District Council (Council) requires esplanade reserves where new sites are created adjacent to lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area' (p.3) - 'Rules and standards within the Subdivision chapter, requiring the creation of an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m (in accordance with section 230 of the RMA), where subdivision involves the creation of one or more allotments less than 4ha' adjacent to relevant waterway etc. (p.3) 	Retain PA-R5		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS569.1760	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9 Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
FS570.1740	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part	Section 5.2.9

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
								Key issue 9: Policy Framework (not addressed elsewhere)
S271.019	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	Rules	Not Stated	Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots of less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers that identify key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.742	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS566.756	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS569.778	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S524.019	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	Rules	Not Stated	Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers that identify key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				lots of less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.				
FS566.1837	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S425.037	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	It is considered that Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. It is considered that this layer can usefully inform applications for esplanade waivers to ensure that at an absolute minimum area that have been identified as part of future connections are not accidentally waived entirely or a limited width accepted. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots a less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers as an information layer.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S529.065	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors. Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps and for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS67.6	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS68.7	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS69.6	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS66.6	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.1953	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS566.1967	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
FS569.1989	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S529.084	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots of less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.	Amend the PDP to include mapped esplanade priority layers identifying key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS67.7	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS68.8	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS69.7	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS66.7	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The relief sought on additional esplanade priority areas lacks specificity, and appears to seek the	Disallow		Accept	Section 5.2.3

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
				addition of additional esplanade priority areas outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.				Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.1972	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS566.1986	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS569.2008	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S272.010	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors. Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps in Kerikeri and any other communities in the district that wish to identify esplanade priority areas.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS277.75	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3

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
								Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.770	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS566.784	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS569.806	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S445.020	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	esplanade priority areas should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity ,active transport and green corridors (items needed within the lifetime of the new district plan).Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. By removing Esplanade Priority areas from the planning/zone maps, Council would fail to indicate to land owners, developers and others that Council has an interest in a stream boundary. Failure to indicate the Council's interest could result in the consenting planner (or those undertaking monitoring), or a future landowner being unaware that	Insert Esplanade Priority areas for Kerikeri in the PDP		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Officer recommendation	Relevant section of S42A Report
				there is Council interest, especially if there are frequent staff changes at Council.				
FS277.84	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS569.1774	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.1753	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S523.010	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Esplanade Priority areas in Kerikeri should continue to be included in DP maps, because this area is experiencing rapid growth and esplanade reserves play an important role in improving connectivity, active transport and green corridors. Esplanade priority areas also help provide transparent, consolidated land use/planning information for Council staff, developers and others. Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps in Kerikeri and any other communities in the district that wish to identify esplanade priority areas.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS277.86	Jenny Collison		Support	essential	Allow		Reject	Section 5.2.3

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
								Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS566.1804	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Support to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
S445.021	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	Failure to indicate the Council's interest could result in the consenting planner (or those undertaking monitoring), or a future landowner being unaware that there is Council interest, especially if there are frequent staff changes at Council.	Insert Esplanade Priority area for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS569.1775	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
FS570.1754	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject	Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas

S446.018	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Oppose	It is considered that Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity. There no longer appears to be an esplanade priority mapped layer. It is considered that this layer can usefully inform applications for esplanade waivers to ensure that at an absolute minimum area that have been identified as part of future connections are not accidentally waived entirely or a limited width accepted. This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers that identify key areas for future connectivity purposes and include as an information layer in the District Plan		Reject	Section 5.2.3 Key issue 3: Esplanade Priority Areas
----------	---------------------------	-------------------------	--------	---	---	--	--------	--

Proposed Far North District Plan – s42A Report Table

				creation where lots a less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.			
FS569.1777	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Reject	
FS570.1777	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Reject	