



**Remember  
submissions  
close at 5pm,  
Friday 21  
October 2022**

## Proposed District Plan submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

Form 5: Submission on Proposed Far North District Plan

**TO: Far North District Council**

This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for the Far North District.

### 1. Submitter details:

<b>Full Name:</b>	Marianna Fenn		
<b>Company / Organisation Name: (if applicable)</b>			
<b>Contact person (if different):</b>			
<b>Full Postal Address:</b>	903B Kohumaru Rd, RD1 Mangonui 0494		
<b>Phone contact:</b>	<b>Mobile:</b> 022 699 4672	<b>Home:</b>	<b>Work:</b>
<b>Email (please print):</b>	Marianna.nz@gmail.com		
2. (Please select one of the two options below)			
<input type="checkbox"/> I <b>could not</b> gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission			
<i>If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please complete point 3 below</i>			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> I <b>am</b> directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (A) Adversely affects the environment; and (B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition			
<i>Note: if you are a person who could gain advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991</i>			
<b>The specific provisions of the Plan that my submission relates to are:</b> <i>(please provide details including the reference number of the specific provision you are submitting on)</i>			
Set out in attached table			
Confirm your position: <input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Support In-part <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <i>(please tick relevant box) Set out in attached table</i>			
<b>My submission is:</b>			



*(Include details and reasons for your position)*

*Set out in attached table*

**I seek the following decision from the Council:**

*(Give precise details. If seeking amendments, how would you like to see the provision amended?)*

*Set out in attached table*

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

*(Please tick relevant box)*

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing - YES

Do you wish to present your submission via Microsoft Teams? - NO

**Signature of submitter:**

*(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)*

**Date: 21 October 2022**

*(A signature is not required if you are making your submission by electronic means)*

**Important information:**

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions (5pm 21 October 2022)
2. Please note that submissions, including your name and contact details are treated as public documents and will be made available on council's website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan Review.
3. Submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

**Send your submission to:**

**Post to:** Proposed District Plan



Strategic Planning and Policy, Far North District Council  
Far North District Council,  
Private Bag 752  
KAIKOHE 0400

Email to: [pdp@fndc.govt.nz](mailto:pdp@fndc.govt.nz)

Or you can also deliver this submission form to any Far North District Council service centre or library, from 8am – 5pm Monday to Friday.

**Submissions close 5pm, 21 October 2022**

**Please refer to [pdp.fndc.govt.nz](http://pdp.fndc.govt.nz) for further information and updates.**

*Please note that original documents will not be returned. Please retain copies for your file.*

#### **Note to person making submission**

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- It contains offensive language
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**SUBMISSION NUMBER**

Date: 21 October 2022

To: Far North District Council, Private Bag 752, Kaikohe 0440,  
e-mail submissions@fndc.govt.nz

From: Marianna Fenn, 903B Kohumaru Rd, RD1 Mangonui 0494

Contact: [Marianna.nz@gmail.com](mailto:Marianna.nz@gmail.com) / 022 699 4672

### SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED FAR NORTH DISTRICT PLAN

My submission points and the relief sought are set out in the table below. I am primarily concerned about the need to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity and other natural values throughout the District.

Natural Environment Values			
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity			
IB-02	Oppose	<p>Far to use orientated and fails to give effect to the environmental bottom lines required by the RMA.</p> <p>Maintaining, protecting and enhancing natural assets will provide multiple benefits, including climate change mitigation, ecosystem services such as cleaner water and more reliable water supply, tourism attractions, and improvements in wellbeing for residents</p>	<p>Amend by replacing with</p> <p><i>The extent and diversity of indigenous biodiversity across the district is maintained, protected, and where possible enhanced</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S542.001</b></p>
New Objective	Support	<p>Need to recognise the importance of encouraging landowners, occupiers and kaitiaki/guardians such as volunteer community groups to protect and enhance biodiversity</p> <p>To date my experience is that FNDC has not performed well in supporting and encouraging conservation initiatives</p>	<p>Add</p> <p><u><i>Landowners, land occupiers, and kaitiaki/guardians are encouraged and supported to protect and enhance the biodiversity values of the land they have an interest in.</i></u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S542.002</b></p>
New Objective	Support	<p>Ecosystem services are little acknowledged in this plan, yet they are essential to maintaining the life supporting capacity of the</p>	<p>Add</p> <p><u><i>The ecosystem services provided by areas of indigenous biodiversity are recognized and enhanced. These services include increased resilience</i></u></p>

		earth and mitigating the effects of climate change	<u>to the effects of climate change, maintaining fresh water quality, and enabling resilient food production systems.</u> <b>S542.003</b>
IB – New Policy	Support	Need to include a policy of identifying areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are likely to be particularly vulnerable and/or change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and establish buffer zones where appropriate. An example is ensuring there are buffer zones around coastal wetlands that anticipate and provide for inland retreat	<i>Identify areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that are particularly vulnerable and/or likely to change in their location and extent due to the effects of climate change and, where appropriate, establish buffer zones to ensure that these areas are able to move and persist</i>  <b>S542.004</b>
IB-P1	Oppose in part	If SNAs are to be protected for future generations they must be identified and mapped throughout the district. This will serve to educate landowners about the value of biodiversity on their land, enable targeted support, and address the risk of incremental district wide loss and degradation of SNA areas	Amend to reflect district wide mapping and rules applicable to SNAs. If SNAs based solely on the presence of regenerating manuka / kanuka are included, these areas should be separately identified and clearly distinguished from other SNAs. These manuka / kanuka SNAs could also be subject to a separate, slightly more permissive, rule regime. <b>S542.005</b>  A large percentage of our property at 903B Kohumaru Rd is identified as SNA and, subject to the boundaries of those SNA areas being refined, I support that designation
IB-P4 and associated definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation	Support in part	Offsetting and compensation should only be available where there will be a net gain in indigenous biodiversity and it should not be seen as being available for consideration as of right  Support definitions of biodiversity offsetting and compensation subject to amendments needed to	Amend (a) to require a net gain in indigenous biodiversity Amend (b) to reflect the need for compensation up to a net gain  Amend definitions of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation to reflect need for net gain  <b>S542.006</b>

		reflect need for net gain in indigenous biodiversity	
IB-P5 and definition of farming	Oppose in part	<p>Query how “unreasonable” will be determined for the purposes of (a). There is increasing awareness and support for the need to transform and improve practices in our agricultural sector. What might have been seen as “unreasonable” in the past may now be a minimum for being able to continue to operate. The wording of this policy may assist in holding back required progress</p> <p>The current definition of “normal farming practices” has been used to avoid prosecution for disturbance of ephemeral wetlands</p>	<p>Amend (a) to</p> <p><del>Does not impose unreasonable restrictions on</del> Allows for existing primary production activities, to continue <del>particularly on highly versatile soils</del> provided that Significant Natural Areas are protected and indigenous biodiversity values of the site are maintained;</p> <p>Amend “farming” definition to exclude significant earthworks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S542.007</b></p>
IB-P6	Support in part	<p>Regulatory methods that include district wide mapping of SNAs is also required</p> <p>Consideration of nature based solutions and rates relief in return for biodiversity protection and enhancement</p>	<p>Amend to reflect introduction of district wide mapping and rules for SNAs in addition to non-regulatory methods</p> <p>Amend to include reference to encouraging nature based solutions for mitigating natural hazards and the effects of climate change e.g creating wetlands and afforestation to mitigate drought and flood effects. <b>S542.008</b></p> <p>Amend to include potential for a reduction or waiver of rates where there is good pest and weed control in place or where maintenance / enhancement of indigenous biodiversity will provide significant ecosystem services e.g. wetlands or afforestation to mitigate flood risk for a wider catchment.</p>
IB-P7	Support	Consideration should be given to providing rates relief and other incentives to encourage landowners	<p>Amend to include reference to potential incentives that could be provided <b>S542.009</b></p>

		to control weeds and animal pests on their land	
IB-P8	Support in part	Eco sourcing is important to protect variations in species genetics	Amend <b>S542.010</b> <i>Assist with protection of <del>Promote the protection of</del> species that are endemic to Northland by <u>promoting, supporting and using eco-sourced</u> plants from within the ecological district</i>
IB-P9	Support in part	Support a requirement to manage domestic pets. Need to also include livestock (pigs, goats, cattle, etc.) as they can be very destructive to habitat for threatened species. The requirements should also extend to land occupiers.  Further limits and conditions on pet ownership and a requirement for pest and weed control could be imposed in the context of a consent for subdivision or development	Amend to require management and (where appropriate) limits on the numbers of domestic pets and livestock for landowners and land occupiers  Amend to clarify that further limits and pest and weed control will be considered when possible and appropriate  <b>S542.011</b>
IB-R1- PER1	Oppose in part	(2) – Dead trees in SNAs should only be felled if they pose a significant safety risk as standing dead trees provide important roost sites for threatened native species such as bats. Where dead trees are felled they must be left to decompose in situ to enable nutrient cycling and provide important habitat  (7) – Clearance of vegetation for the purposes of developing a residential unit within an SNA should be a controlled activity to ensure adequate consideration has been given to avoiding and/or mitigating adverse effects	Delete (2) and (12).  Delete (7) and add a new controlled activity rule for new residential units in SNAs  Amend (9) <i>... not exceed 4 m in total width</i>  Amend (10) to reduce it to vegetation where it is possible to establish that it is under 5 years old without expert input.  <b>S542.012</b>

		<p>(9) – The width of permitted clearance for fence lines is excessive. While it may be necessary to drive posts using a tractor you do not need tractor clearance down either side of the fenceline</p> <p>(10) – Recognise the need for landowners to be able to keep their land in a “cleared” state without needing resource consent but the time frame should be reduced to 5 year old vegetation and there has to be an available evidential basis to establish the age e.g. google earth, photos or other records.</p> <p>(12) – The Forests Act does not have the same purpose or principles as the RMA so the council cannot rely on decisions made under this Act</p>	
IB-R3	Oppose in part	<p>Allowing for yearly 100m2 clearance of vegetation likely to result in incremental degradation and loss of SNAs.</p> <p>Some SNA areas may be so rare or vulnerable that consent should be required for any clearance or disturbance</p>	<p>Amend to reduce the threshold for clearance to 50 square meters every 5 years.</p> <p>Separately identify particularly SNAs that include particularly rare or vulnerable indigenous biodiversity and require consent for any clearance or disturbance of these areas</p> <p><b>S542.013</b></p>
IB-R4-PER1	Oppose in part	<p>Remnant Forests should qualify as SNAs under the broad RPS definition and should be protected</p> <p>The extent of clearance allowed as a permitted activity is excessive. Allowable clearance will add up to very large areas</p>	<p>Delete references to clearance within a remnant forest</p> <p>Amend to limit permitted clearance to 500m2 every 5 years and/or restrict to clearly defined purposes e.g. maintaining cleared areas and fence lines.</p>



		where land is held in multiple titles and over longer time periods. Justifiable reasons for clearance could be provided by clearly defined exceptions	Clarify whether this restriction on the area that can be cleared includes or is in addition to permitted clearance of regenerating vegetation under IB-R1- PER1  <b>S542.014</b>
IB-R4-PER2	Oppose in part	Clearance of up to 100m2 in a potential SNA will result in incremental loss and degradation.	Amend (2) to limit clearance of up to 50m2 every 5 years.  <b>S542.015</b>
IB-R5	Oppose	Plantation forestry within an SNA should be a non-complying activity.	Amend to non-complying activity status  <b>S542.016</b>
<b>Natural character</b>			
NATC - Objectives	Support in part	Need to assess and map natural character areas as has been done for the coastal environment.  The extent of these natural character areas should allow for change / retreat as a result of the effects of climate change. E.g. buffer zones	Insert new objective "Assess and identify in district plan maps natural character areas around wetland, lake, and river margins" or similar. <b>S542.017</b> Insert new objective "Identify and establish buffer zones that encompass potential changes in the location and extent of natural character areas as a result of natural processes and the effects of climate change"
NATC-P2	Support in part	Support identification and assessment of natural character areas but need to map these throughout the district.	Amend to include reference to maps of identified natural character areas in both coastal and inland parts of the district.  <b>S542.018</b>
NATC-P3	Oppose in part	The reference to "enabling" suggests a highly permissive approach	Amend to "Allow for restricted amounts vegetation clearance ..."  <b>S542.019</b>