

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
FS151.348	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
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
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
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 consistent with our original submission	Reject
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
S436.030	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	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. 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 protection of conservation values of riparian margins, maintenance of water quality and aquatic habitats and the enhancement of public access and	Retain policies and rules that: - 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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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
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
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
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
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
FS196.162	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko nui	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
FS569.1770	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1749	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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
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
FS151.355	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
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
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
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation	
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	
FS196.159	Joe Carr		Support		Allow	Reject	
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
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
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
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
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
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
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 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	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				smaller lots. We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to land use applications.			
FS111.087	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
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
FS566.791	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.813	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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
FS111.088	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
FS277.52	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential to provide for environment and community	Allow		Accept in part
FS277.53	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment and community	Allow		Accept in part
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
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	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		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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	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
FS566.797	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.819	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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
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
FS566.2093	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2115	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
FS569.1772	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1751	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS196.161	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept
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
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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
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
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 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-O2 or ensure that amendments include similar wording that achieves the same intent		Accept
FS196.160	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept
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
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
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
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	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
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
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
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
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
FS67.74	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
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	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.			
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
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 non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part
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
FS277.54	Jenny Collison		Support	Essential for the environment and community	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS566.790	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.812	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.186	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.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				We consider that the requirement for esplanade reserve should apply to 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
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
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 respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.113	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
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2087	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2109	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
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 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.	Amend provisions to include requirements for esplanade reserves when consenting land use and other forms of development		Accept in part
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
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
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 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
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	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
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
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
FS566.2088	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2110	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS88.62	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
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
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
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
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 neither effective nor efficient with respect to the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.	Disallow		Accept in part
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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 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.	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
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
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
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
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S445.016	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Policies	Not Stated	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
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
FS569.1771	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1750	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1774	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.798	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.820	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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 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
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
FS566.2094	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2116	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
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 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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values			
FS569.1773	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1752	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS196.158	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
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
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
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
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
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
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	Disallow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the objectives, requiring a non-targeted provision of esplanade reserves.			
S272.001	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P1	Support	<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.</p> <p>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-P1		Accept in part
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
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
FS566.776	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.798	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S529.056	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	PA-P1	Support	<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.</p> <p>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</p>	Retain PA-P1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				indigenous species that are classed as threatened or at risk under NZ Threat Classification System and areas with significant ecological values.			
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
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
FS566.1959	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1981	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S523.001	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)	PA-P1	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-P1		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
S445.001	Kapiro Conservation Trust	PA-P1	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- P1		Accept in part
FS569.1756	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1736	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				chapter any references to esplanade reserves need to be amended to include the words esplanade strips.		
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
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) - '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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
FS569.1757	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1737	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS151.349	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
FS151.350	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept
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
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
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
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
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
FS196.157	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS346.399	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.			
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
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
S272.011	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P2	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-P2		Accept in part
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
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
FS566.785	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.807	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
FS566.2081	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2103	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
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.</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-P2		Accept in part
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
FS47.009	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part
FS566.410	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept
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 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 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
FS47.0010	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part
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
S187.041	The Shooting Box 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,	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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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.			
FS47.013	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust		Oppose		Disallow	retain Policy PA-P2 as drafted in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part
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
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
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
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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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 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 restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.	Accept in part
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	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					e. restrictions on public access are necessary to ensure public health and safety.		
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
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
FS569.1778	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1778	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS151.351	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
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
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
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
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
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
FS196.156	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS66.117	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The policy as drafted is appropriate having regard to the objectives it implements.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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
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
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 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
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
FS566.757	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.779	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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-P3Allow 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
FS111.102	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
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
FS566.1987	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2009	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S524.020	Vision Kerikeri (Vision for	PA-P3	Oppose	The waiving of esplanade requirements is not supported. It is sought that the wording is changed to make it	Amend PA-P3Allow a Consider an application for waiver of any requirement for , or a reduction in the required width of, an esplanade reserve where the		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Kerikeri and Environs, VKK)			clear that exceptions should only occur in exceptional circumstances.	<p>area is not identified as esplanade priority, and it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
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
FS566.1838	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S272.014	Our Kerikeri Community Charitable Trust	PA-P3	Support	<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.</p> <p>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-P3		Accept in part
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.788	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.810	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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
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
FS566.2082	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2104	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
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.</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-P3		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
S445.003	Kapiro Conservation Trust	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.</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-P3		Accept in part
FS569.1758	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1738	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS196.155	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept
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

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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 RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
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
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
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
FS570.775	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS566.789	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.811	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept
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
FS570.2069	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.2083	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS569.2105	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
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. 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
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
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</p>	Retain PA-P4		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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)			
FS569.1759	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept
FS570.1739	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept
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
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
FS196.154	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
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
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 RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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
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
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
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
FS566.786	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.808	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
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
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
FS566.2084	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2106	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
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. 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
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
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 	Retain PA-R5		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				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)			
FS569.1760	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS570.1740	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Accept in part
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
FS570.742	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.756	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.778	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
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 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
FS566.1837	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S425.037	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	It is considered that Council should take all opportunities to gain access to waterbodies, as	Insert Council mapped esplanade priority layers as an information layer.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Cycle Trail Charitable Trust			<p>there is always future potential for contributing to connectivity.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>This layer can also usefully be used to encourage voluntary creation where lots a less than 4ha as a mitigation measure or off set.</p>		
S529.065	Carbon Neutral NZ Trust	General / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	<p>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.</p> <p>Esplanade Priority area should also be included for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas</p>	Insert esplanade priority areas on planning maps and for any other communities in the district that wish to identify Esplanade Priority areas.	Reject
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
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
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
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	Disallow	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				outside a Schedule 1 RMA process and without proper s32 assessment.			
FS570.1953	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1967	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.1989	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
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
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
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
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
FS66.7	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
FS570.1972	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.1986	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.2008	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
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
FS277.75	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS570.770	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS566.784	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS569.806	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
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 there is Council interest, especially if there are frequent staff changes at Council.	Insert Esplanade Priority areas for Kerikeri in the PDP		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS277.84	Jenny Collison		Support	I agree	Allow		Reject
FS569.1774	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.1753	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Support to the extent the submission is consistent with our original submissions.	Allow		Reject
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
FS277.86	Jenny Collison		Support	essential	Allow		Reject
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
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
FS569.1775	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS570.1754	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
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	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

				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.		
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