

**Before the Environment Court
At Auckland**

**I Mua I Te Kōti Taiao
Tāmaki Makaurau Rohe**

ENV-2026-AKL-000158

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA")

In the matter of an appeal under clause 14(1) of Schedule 1 of the RMA

And in the matter of the Proposed Far North District Plan

Between **Lucklaw Farm Limited**
Appellant

And **Far North District Council**
Respondent

**Notice of Mataka Residents Association
Incorporated's wish to be a party to
proceedings**

Dated: 2 September 2026

Presented for filing by:

Joanna Beresford



PO Box 1088 Shortland Street,
Auckland 1140

joanna@beresfordlaw.co.nz
+64 21 114 1277

TO: The Registrar
Environment Court
Auckland

AND: Far North District Council

AND: The Appellant

1. Mataka Residents Association Incorporated (**Mātaka**) wishes to be a party under s 274 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**) to the following proceedings:

The appeal by Lucklaw Farm Limited (**the Appellant**) against the decision of the Far North District Council in respect of the Proposed Far North District Plan (**PDP**), ENV-2026-AKL-000158 (**the Appeal**).

2. Mātaka is a person who has an interest in the proceeding that is greater than the interest that the general public has in terms of s 274(1)(d) of the RMA having lodged submissions (No. S230, S597, FS143 and FS581) and an appeal (ENV-2026-AKL-000143) on the PDP.
3. Mātaka is a person who has made a submission about the subject matter of the proceedings in terms of s 274(e) of the RMA having lodged original and further submissions on the PDP.
4. Mātaka is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C of the RMA.
5. Mātaka is interested in the parts of the proceeding that relate to the relief sought in the Appeal identified in **Schedule One**. Mataka supports aspects of the relief sought and opposes aspects of the relief sought in part as set out in Schedule One.
6. To the extent that Mātaka supports the relief sought by the Appellant, it is supported on the grounds that it:
 - (a) Will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is otherwise inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.
 - (b) Will not generate significant adverse effects on the environment.
 - (c) Is appropriate in terms of the requirements of s 32 of the RMA and the relevant provisions of applicable planning instruments.

7. To the extent that Mātaka opposes the relief sought by the Appellant, it is opposed on the grounds that it:
- (a) Will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is otherwise inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.
 - (b) Will not generate significant adverse effects on the environment.
 - (c) Is appropriate in terms of the requirements of s 32 of the RMA and the relevant provisions of applicable planning instruments.
8. Mātaka agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution.

Dated: 2 September 2026

MATAKA RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED by its solicitors and duly authorised agents Beresford Law



JL Beresford

Address for service: The offices of Beresford Law. Level 6, 20 Waterloo Quadrant, Auckland, 1010. PO Box 1088 Shortland Street Auckland 1140. Attention: Joanna Beresford, Telephone: +64 9 307 1277, Mobile: +64 21 114 1277, Email: joanna@beresfordlaw.co.nz.

Schedule One: Relevant Parts of Relief Sought in Appeal

Appellant	Provision	Relief Sought in Appeal	Support/Oppose
Lucklaw Farm Limited (Coastal Issues)	Coastal Environment	a) Allow the appeal by setting aside and reversing the Council's decision to reject submission points S550.001 and S585.001. b) Direct that the Far North District Plan include a districtwide rule which sets standards and controls on the use of vehicles on identified beaches, foreshore, and adjacent public land in the Far North District, to give effect to Policy 20 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010, with suggested drafting at Attachment 2. c) Provide for a default activity rule (e.g. a discretionary or restricted discretionary activity rule) in the event of non-compliance with any controlled or permitted activity standards.	Opposed to the extent that it would apply to the Whale Bay and the existing boat ramp facilities in that location. Supported to the extent that it would apply to other beaches adjoining Mātaka Station.