



Form 6

**FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT, OR PARTIAL SUPPORT OF, SUBMISSIONS ON A PUBLICLY NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE**

Under Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

TO:

**PLANNING AND POLICY  
 FAR NORTH DISTRICT COUNCIL (FNDC)  
 PRIVATE BAG 752  
 KAIKOHE 0400**

FOR FNDC OFFICE USE ONLY	
Further Submission No:	
Receipt Date:	

TO: **PLANNING AND POLICY, FNDC**

NAME: **TOKERAU BEACH TRUST (THE FURTHER SUBMITTER)**

1. This is a further submission in support, or in partial support, of submissions made on the Proposed Far North District Plan (**PFNDP**).
2. The further submitter:
 

*Has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has due to their significant landholdings legally described as Lot 3 DP206044 located at Tokerau Beach.*
3. The further submission is contained in **Table 1** on the attached sheet(s).
4. In regard to the various submissions that the further submitter supports, or partially supports, we comment as follows:

**Plan Section – Rural Production**

- *The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek renaming of the Rural Production zone to ‘General Rural zone’ (or similar).*
- *The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek greater acknowledgement of the multi-faceted role of the rural areas of the district, which includes rural production but also providing opportunities for the housing of rural workers and for meeting the high demand for rural residential housing.*
- *The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek additional subdivision and development potential (greater flexibility) within the Rural Production zone, especially on land that has poor soils and that cannot support rural production activities. PFNDP provisions should be based on the ability of land to be utilised for rural production activities rather than applying blanket restrictions.*
- *The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek to maintain the number of dwellings that can be constructed on a lot, and the ratio of dwellings per square metre lot size, as per the relevant provisions of the Operative Far North District Plan (OFNDP).*

### Plan Section - Subdivision

- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek to enable environmental benefit and Management Plan subdivision within the Rural Production zone, especially on land that has poor soils that cannot support rural production activities.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek to enable environmental benefit and Management Plan subdivision on smaller lots across the district to promote the wider protection and enhancement of indigenous vegetation and freshwater assets, as well as the planting of new indigenous vegetation and the creation of new wetlands.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek better acknowledgement of the important role that rural lifestyle subdivision has in the rural area, and that rural residential activities can be a sustainable (and, in many cases, the only viable) use of rural land resource.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek to reduce the minimum lot size requirements for subdivision within the Rural Production zone, especially on land that falls outside of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek amendment of the subdivision rules so that they acknowledge, and deal with differently, subdivision of land that falls within and outside Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays where these overlays affect a single legal land parcel.

### Plan Section – Coastal Environment

- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that query the purpose of the Coastal Environment overlay and how it relates to the Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that promote the assessment of proposals in the Coastal Environment zone, and the Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays, on merit, rather than by applying a blanket approach that establishes ‘avoid’ as the default position.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek that the rules and provisions for land use and subdivision within the underlying zone should apply within the Coastal Environment overlay, unless land falls within the Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays.
- The further submitter supports, or partially supports, those submissions that seek greater flexibility in relation to the establishment of new buildings or structures in the Coastal Environment overlay.

5. The reasons for the further submitter’s support, and/or partial support, for the submissions identified in **Table 1** are as follows:

- The relief sought by the submissions supported, or partially supported, by the further submitter will:
  - o Enable those people with rural landholdings located within the Rural Production zone, and within the Outstanding Natural Landscape and High Natural Character overlays, that cannot be used for rural production to better provide for their ongoing social, economic and cultural well-being.
  - o Enable the sustainable use of land resource for rural residential activities where the effects of such activities can be appropriately and effectively avoided, mitigated and/or remedied.
  - o Maximise opportunities for the protection and enhancement of indigenous vegetation and freshwater assets in the rural areas, regardless of lot size.
  - o Ensure that the PFNDP achieves the purpose, and that it is consistent with the principles, of the RMA.

6. The submitter seeks the following decision from the local authority:  
*That the relief sought by the primary submitter, which is supported of partially supported by this further submission, be duly noted and considered by FNDC and that consequential changes are made to the PFNDP to give effect to the relief sought (as specified in **Table 1**).*
7. The further submitter wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.
8. If others make a similar further submission, the further submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

**SUBMITTER DETAILS**

Date: 4 September 2023

Signed: 

Address for Service: Tokerau Beach Trust  
c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited  
P O Box 5760, Victoria Street West  
**AUCKLAND 1142**  
Attention: Philip Comer

Email: p.comer@harrisingrierson.com

Telephone: (09) 966 3382

**NOTE TO PERSON MAKING FURTHER SUBMISSION:**

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making the further submission to the local authority.

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B. If you are a person who could gain an 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.

**TABLE 1: FURTHER SUBMISSIONS MADE BY TOKERAU BEACH TRUST****Plan Section – Rural Production**

1/2

3

4

6 allow

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason 5 amend
Sean Frieling	S357.026	Support	The PDP needs to redefine the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq mtrs. This should be corrected by amending RPROZ objectives, policies and rules zones to accommodate things other than rural production. Support the development bonus provisions for allow for smaller lot sizes in the rural	Amend Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules as separately submitted and allow smaller blocks of land ie.2000 sq mtrs Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives, policies and rules zones so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.  <b>FS368.001</b>
Leah Frieling	S358.031 S358.030	Support in Part	The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m².	Amend the Rural Production zone rules so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.  <b>FS368.002</b> amend <b>FS368.003</b> 6 allow in part

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
<p><b>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand</b></p>	<p>S421.207 S421.204 S421.205 S421.206</p> <p>each point lodge a new FS point</p>	<p><b>Support in Part</b></p>	<p>...</p> <p>The concern Federated Farmers has is that the overview is focused on the absolute protection of highly productive from any activities other than primary production. The approach taken by the Council to prevent the fragmentation of rural production land is support but acknowledgement is also needed that all highly productive may not be profitable for the landowner. It would be unequitable for the Council to prohibit a rural landowner who has cared for the land for many years from achieving the real potential value of that land. The proposed district plan has strayed into private property rights through dictating what can and cannot be done on rural production land...</p>	<p>Amend the Rules to recognise and provide for private property rights and allow landowners to subdivide land in the rural production zone for specific purposes such as creating lifestyle lots and lots for family members (amongst other matters).</p> <p>5 amend</p> <p>6 allow in part</p> <p><b>FS368.004</b> <b>FS368.005</b> <b>FS368.006</b> <b>FS368.007</b></p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
<p data-bbox="94 279 392 311"><b>Martin John Yuretich</b></p> <p data-bbox="94 351 302 383"><b>Joel Vieviorka</b></p>	<p data-bbox="425 279 548 311"><b>S40.015</b></p> <p data-bbox="425 391 548 422"><b>S41.015</b></p>	<p data-bbox="660 279 772 311"><b>Support</b></p> <p data-bbox="660 391 772 422"><b>Support</b></p>	<p data-bbox="846 279 1480 734">The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the rural production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision.</p> <p data-bbox="846 774 884 798">...</p> <p data-bbox="846 821 1480 933">It is correct to protect rural productive potential, but this can be achieved without imposing a total restriction on rural lifestyle properties.</p>	<p data-bbox="1498 279 2150 518">RPROZ-R3 - Amend allotment sizes, perhaps with a limited number of allotments of a minimum of 8000m<sup>2</sup> or 1ha, then 4ha generally after that. Smaller lot sizes should apply for properties (or parts thereof) that do not consist of highly productive land.</p> <p data-bbox="1498 558 1534 582">...</p> <p data-bbox="1498 606 2150 718">Consequential amendments to RPROZ-R3 Residential activity and SUB-R7 Management plan subdivision.</p> <p data-bbox="1601 782 1736 837"><b>FS368.008</b> <b>FS368.009</b></p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Sapphire Surveyors Limited	S348.002 S348.003	Support	The new subdivision rules, requiring a minimum lot size of 8ha (without a Management Plan) will severely restrict the ability to create small rural lots in the Rural Production zone. The reason given for this rule is to protect the productive potential of the rural area, in particular, highly productive land. However, the majority of land in the Far North District does not come under this category, and the PDP does not distinguish between highly productive land and less productive land when it comes to subdivision	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to align with changes sought by submitter to Standard SUB-S1 as it relates to subdivision in the Rural Production zone.  FS368.010 FS368.011  5 amend 6 allow
Lynley Newport	S104.001	Support	The discretionary activity minimum lot size should remain at four hectares and, as such, the discretionary residential intensity ratio in Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 should similarly be four hectares.	Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 DIS-1 as follows - The site area per residential unit is at least <del>8ha</del> 4ha.  FS368.012

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
<p>Sean Frieling</p> <p>Leah Frieling</p> <p>LJ King Ltd</p>	<p>S357.041</p> <p>S358.044</p> <p>S464.041</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title) and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m<sup>2</sup> of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.</p>	<p>Amend to retain the operative district plan rule to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m<sup>2</sup> of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Amend Rule RPROZ-R3 to reflect the requirements in the Operative District Plan, i.e. 1 dwelling per 12ha</p> <p><b>FS368.013</b>  <b>FS368.014</b>  <b>FS368.015</b></p>



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
<b>Amber Hookway</b>  <b>Wilson Hookway</b>	<b>S261.002</b>  <b>S264.002</b>	<b>Support</b>	<p>Submitter opposes change from "Residential development shall be limited to one unit per 12ha of land" to "The site area per residential unit is at least 40ha". There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to be able to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners of larger blocks are not disadvantaged by only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.</p>	<p>Amend to reinstate the equivalent operative District Plan rule (one residential unit per 12ha of land, with no maximum number per site)</p> <p><b>FS368.016</b> <b>FS368.017</b></p>
<b>Danielle Hookway</b>  <b>Lianne Kennedy</b>  <b>Allen Hookway</b>	<b>S309.002</b>  <b>S310.002</b>  <b>S311.002</b>	<b>Support</b>	<p>There is a housing crisis and whanau are coming home to live on the land. 12ha is a huge area to have one dwelling and all that will happen will be the Far North becomes full of unpermitted and unsafe dwellings as this rule change will not stop family living on their land. There should be no limit to the number. This should be based on land size so owners on larger blocks are not disadvantaged but only being allowed a maximum of 6 regardless of their land size.</p>	<p>Amend rule RPROZ-R3 to retain the current rule allowing residential development of one unit per 12 ha of land with no maximum number per site.</p> <p><b>FS368.018</b> <b>FS368.019</b> <b>FS368.020</b></p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
FNR Properties Limited	S319.002	Support	The submitter considers that as RPROZ-R3 will be reducing the permitted threshold from one residential unit per 12ha to one residential unit per 40ha and limiting the total number of residential units on one site in the Rural Production Zone to six is overall a substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the zone and is heavy handed.	Amend RPZ-R3 to allow for a higher residential intensity and/or provide for more options for residential intensity as a controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activity.  <b>FS368.021</b>
FNR Properties Limited	S334.001	Support	The PDP does not provide for any subdivision in the RPZ as a Restricted Discretionary Activity, and that the Discretionary Activity thresholds have been significantly reduced. The substantial reduction in the permitted residential intensity threshold in the RPZ is extremely heavy-handed and will result in significant adverse effects on the socioeconomic wellbeing of the Far North District. Imposing such restrictions on residential intensity will only contribute further to the current housing crisis that is being observed both locally and nationwide. Further, the RPZ objectives and policies as notified primarily provide for primary production activities in the RPZ and do not recognise that some properties are no longer suitable for production, or never have been suitable or used for production. Providing more	Amend the RPZ provisions to allow for a higher residential intensity in the RPZ and/or to provide for more options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity.  <b>FS368.022</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
			options for residential intensity as a Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary Activity would be more appropriate as this will enable such development to occur in the RPZ while providing for case by case consideration of any proposed residential activity within the context of the subject site and immediate surrounding environment (as opposed to a 'one size fits all' approach).	
Elbury Holdings	S485.041	Support	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting. It is submitted that that the rule is currently effective, and should remain the same, to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m <sup>2</sup> of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.	Amend to ensure that housing can still be provided in the general rural zone as a permitted activity as long as the subject site has a minimum of 12 hectares of land, and the minimum area of 3000m <sup>2</sup> of exclusive use surrounding the dwelling.  <b>FS368.023</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Elbury Holdings	S519.040	Support	We do not support the new permitted residential intensity rule density (multiple dwellings per title), and submit that it be retained at the 1 dwelling per 12ha intensity, as per the existing operative district plan. This is requested as still allows for a relatively low density of housing relative to land area, but still allows for the provision of housing in a rural setting.	Retain Rule 8.6.5.1.1 'Residential Intensity' under the operative district plan.  <b>FS368.024</b>
Thomson Survey Ltd	S222.091	Support	The discretionary activity residential activity site area per residential unit should be reduced from at least 8ha to at least 4ha.	Amend RPROZ-3 DIS-1 to read as follows: DIS-1 The site area per residential unit is at least 4ha.  <b>FS368.025</b>
Bentzen Farm Limited	S167.090	Support	The zoned is inappropriately named "Rural Production". Large parts of the district that is zoned this is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes. The zone should be renamed to "General Rural" which more accurately reflects the wider range of activities that occur in the rural environments of the Far North.	Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities"  <b>FS368.026</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
<p><b>The Shooting Box Limited</b></p> <p><b>Wendover Two Limited</b></p> <p><b>Matauri Trustee Limited</b></p> <p><b>P S Yates Family Trust</b></p>	<p><b>S187.079</b></p> <p><b>S222.083</b></p> <p><b>S243.108</b></p> <p><b>S333.080</b></p>	<p><b>Support</b></p>	<p>...large parts of the district that is zoned Rural Production is not suitable for rural production and certainly is not retained for rural production purposes; these activities are provided for in the zone as drafted (at least by the rules, but not recognised in the zone name; the zone name should recognise the broader range of land uses which occur in rural parts of the district; sustain the productive capacity of the soil and the rural character and amenity values that are key elements; the National Planning Standards "Zone Framework Standard" refers to the "General Rural Zone" which is a better fit; and discussion concerning the primary objective of the zone.</p>	<p>Insert the following to the Overview: "The purpose of the zone is also to contribute to the social, economic and cultural well-being of the district by providing for a range of other land use activities".</p> <p><b>FS368.027</b> <b>FS368.028</b> <b>FS368.029</b> <b>FS368.030</b></p>
<p><b>Leah Frieling</b></p>	<p><b>S358.029</b></p>	<p><b>Support in Part</b></p>	<p>The Plan redefines the Rural Production zone so that it is based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production i.e. Rural Production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing i.e. 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>Amend the Rural Production zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.</p> <p><b>FS368.031</b></p>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Michael Foy	S472.030 S472.031	Support in Part	A separate alternative submission is to ask that the Plan redefines the RPROZ so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production. ie. Rural production zoning on poor soils is wrong. That is the right place to put smaller areas for housing ie.2000sq mtrs.	Amend the Rural Production Zone objectives so that productive land is defined based on its ability to produce food but can accommodate things other than rural production.  FS368.032 FS368.033

**Plan Section – Subdivision**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
Lynley Newport	S116.001	Support	Support initiative for environmental benefit subdivision and the starting category of activity (restricted discretionary). There should not be any discouragement to landowners wanting to utilise this rule, and yet making non achievement of with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 defaulting to non-complying activity status does just that. Believe non achievement of the RDIS requirements should only default to discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule SUB-R6, subject to the following amendments to activity status: Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS - 1, RDIS-2,RDIS-3, RDIS-4, and RDIS-5, <b>RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved:</b> Discretionary Activity status where compliance not achieved with RDIS-6, RDIS-7 and RDIS-8 is not achieved: Non-complying. <b>FS368.034</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
<p><b>Setar Thirty Six Limited</b></p> <p><b>Matauri Trustee Limited</b></p> <p><b>P S Yates Family Trust</b></p>	<p><b>S168.058</b></p> <p><b>S243.075</b></p> <p><b>S333.050</b></p>	<p><b>Support in Part</b></p>	<p>The rule appropriately recognises that that limited rural lifestyle subdivision may be a sustainable use of land resources, particularly where they are degraded and unsuited to productive use and significant environmental gains can be made. In these circumstances, subdivision, through an injection of capital and introduction of a 'community of care' and legal protection/going obligations, allows for restoration and enhancement opportunities to be implemented and maintained in perpetuity.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The balance lot requirement of 40ha is unnecessary and will negate the effectiveness of the rule on smaller sites which may have equal or better ecological values worthy of protection.</p>	<p>Amend Rule SUB-R6 by: 1. Deleting RDIS-3; and 2. Amending RDIS-6 as follows: All proposed new environmental allotments are to be a minimum size of 2ha in area <del>and the balance lot must be greater than 40ha.</del></p> <p><b>FS368.035</b> <b>FS368.036</b> <b>FS368.037</b></p>







































Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
<b>Waiaua Bay Farm Limited</b>	<b>S463.053</b>	<b>Support</b>	It is considered inappropriate to require all significant adverse effects to be avoided in areas of the coastal environment outside of "significant" (in a RMA section 6 sense) ONC, ONL and ONF areas. It is appropriate to facilitate an assessment of the merits of proposals with such effects rather than requiring outright avoidance as a first principle policy setting.	Amend Policy CE-P3 as follows: CE-P3 Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other Manage any adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of the coastal environment in locations not identified as: a. outstanding natural character; b. ONL; and c. ONF.
<b>Bentzen Farm Limited</b> <b>The Shooting Box Limited</b> <b>Wendover Two Limited</b> <b>Matauri Trustee Limited</b> <b>P S Yates Family Trust</b> <b>Setar Thirty Six Limited</b>	<b>S167.072</b> <b>S187.062</b> <b>S222.064</b> <b>S243.090</b> <b>S333.063</b> <b>S168.071</b>	<b>Support</b>	Policy CE-P9 seeks to prohibit land use and subdivision that would result in any loss and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities in outstanding natural character areas. This policy is not implemented by any rules and, moreover, is inconsistent with Policy CE-P2 which better gives effect to the NZCPS.	Delete Policy CE-P9.  <b>FS 368. 107</b> <b>FS 368. 108</b> <b>FS 368. 109</b> <b>FS 368. 110</b> <b>FS 368. 111</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
<b>Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand</b>	<b>S421.185</b>	<b>Support</b>	Federated Farmers does not support policy CEP9. The policy is inconsistent with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 in that it appears to prohibit all land use and subdivision from all outstanding natural character areas located in the coastal environment. The policy as proposed is overly restrictive and does not provide for appropriate subdivision and land use to occur. It is not possible to undertake the sustainable management of the coastal environment if there is no framework that allows for appropriate activities with no more than minor effects to occur.	Delete Policy CE-P9.  <b>FS368.112</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/ Support	Submission	Reason
<b>Bentzen Farm Limited</b>  <b>The Shooting Box Limited</b>  <b>Wendover Two Limited</b>  <b>Matauri Trustee Limited</b>  <b>P S Yates Family Trust</b>  <b>Setar Thirty Six Limited</b>	<b>S167.073</b>  <b>S187.063</b>  <b>S222.065</b>  <b>S243.091</b>  <b>S333.064</b>  <b>S168.072</b>	<b>Support</b>	<p>Policy CE-P10 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to preserve and protect the natural character of the coastal environment, and to address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters "where relevant to the application". This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.</p>	Delete Policy CE-P10.  <b>FS368.113</b> <b>FS368.114</b> <b>FS368.115</b> <b>FS368.116</b> <b>FS368.117</b> <b>FS368.118</b>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Oppose/Support	Submission	Reason
<b>Suzanne Linda Ashmore</b>  <b>Cavalli Properties Limited</b>	<b>S169.002</b>  <b>S177.002</b>	<b>Support</b>	<p>Where there is no ONC, ONL or ONF within the Coastal Environment Overlay, there is no requirement to restrict development to any extent greater than provided for by the rules of the underlying zone. Rule CE-R1 is an unnecessary constraint on permitted development under the General Residential zone and is inconsistent with the Northland Regional Policy Statement provisions for the Coastal Environment</p>	<p>Amend Rule CE-R1 so that it does not apply to land within the Coastal Environment overlay where such land is not within an ONC, ONL or ONF</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>FS368.119</b> <b>FS368.120</b></p>
<b>Willam Goodfellow</b>  <b>Ian Jepson</b>  <b>Ricky Faesen Kloet</b>  <b>Philip Thornton</b>  <b>Mark John Wyborn</b>	<b>S493.008</b>  <b>S494.008</b>  <b>S495.009</b>  <b>S496.006</b>  <b>S497.006</b>	<b>Support</b>	<p>The submitter also considers that the activity status and standards imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on setback for buildings from MHWS, and limitations over the area, height, colour and reflectivity of buildings</p>	<p>Amend provisions within the plan that impose limitations on the area of new buildings located within the coastal environment overlay be deleted.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>FS368.121</b> <b>FS368.122</b> <b>FS368.123</b> <b>FS368.124</b> <b>FS368.125</b></p>
<b>Omata Estate</b>	<b>S548.003</b>	<b>Support in Part</b>	<p>The PDP should provide for new buildings and structures to be established on rural sites within the Coastal Environment through a Restricted Discretionary resource consent where it can be determined that the adverse effects of development can be appropriately avoided, remedied, or mitigated.</p>	<p>Amend CE-R1 to provide for the establishment of new buildings on structures outside of an urban zone (not within a high natural character area or outstanding natural character area) as a restricted discretionary activity with associated matters of discretion and assessment criteria.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>FS368.126</b></p>