

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S11.003	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	The Ipipiri Nature Conservancy Trust (the Trust) has recently purchased Elliot Bay Farm in Far North District. The Trust is generally supportive of the Far North Proposed District Plan as it affects the land it administers and notes the work of the Trust will significantly assist Council to achieve objectives in the proposed plan such as improving public access to coastal area and protecting natural character. The Trust is however concerned that some provisions of the coastal and natural character overlays may make its work expensive and difficult. The Trust is seeking clarification or amendment of these overlay provisions to allow it to upgrade and existing public camping area, construct walking tracks and undertake restoration work.	Amend the provisions (by way of specific controls) or at least clarification to allow the following activities to be undertaken within the land at Elliot Bay Farm (most of the farm encompassed at 1077A and 1076 Rawhiti Road, Russell or certificate of titles NA40A/1111 and NA1111/297), which is currently zoned Rural Production, with Coastal and Outstanding Natural Landscape overlays - Formation of a high quality all weather walking track that includes a section from Whangamumu Harbour to Ngaioitonga Scenic Reserve. This track (maximum width 2metres) will go above Elliot Bay (outside the Coastal hazard areas) then head inland alongside Rawhiti Road before heading inland up Wairoa Stream. (Note: maps showing possible walking tracks are attached to original submission) - Maintain and upgrade the existing summer camping ground at Elliot Bay with associated car parking, walking tracks and facilities NB buildings associated with this camping ground will be toilets and structures to provide water, refuse disposal etc (new built accommodation is not planned at this site). - The potential for DOC type huts near Whangamumu and in the Wairoa Stream catchment to cater for walkers on the multi-day walk. - Directional and interpretive signs. - Restoration and amenity plantings of native species with associated fencing to exclude stock.	Accept in part
S157.003	Tane's Tree Trust - Northland Totara Working Group	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support	It is critical that sustainable indigenous forestry activities are not subject to unnecessary additional, costly and uncertain resource management consenting processes required by the District Plan. In contrast, appropriate sustainable indigenous forest management activities under the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) approved 'Sustainable Forest Management Plans' (SFMPs) need to be encouraged, supported, and explicitly provided for to ensure the following: 1. Harvests under MPI approved provisions of Part 3A of the Forests Act (e.g. SFMPs) are attributed permitted	Amend the District Plan to allow harvests under Ministry of Primary Industries' approved sustainable forest management plans and permits as permitted activities in all rural zones, Significant Natural Areas and Outstanding Natural Landscapes.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity status throughout the District - including within Significant Natural Areas and areas designated as Outstanding Landscapes. 2. Sustainable indigenous forestry is supported and encouraged as an example of an appropriate nature-based land use activity and recognised as a form of formal protection for areas of native forest, including within Significant Natural Areas.			
FS46.2	Paul Quinlan		Support	Clause 3.10 (6) (e) of The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), recently approved by government, makes it clear that harvests under MPI approved SFM Permits and Plans (under the provisions of the Forests Act) should be considered acceptable in SNAs. It follows that they should be treated as Permitted Activities in District Plans.	Allow		Accept in part
FS404.0010	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Clause 3.10 (6) (e) of The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), recently approved by government, makes it clear that harvests under MPI approved SFM Permits and Plans (under the provisions of the Forests Act) should be considered acceptable in SNAs. It follows that they should be treated as Permitted Activities in District Plans.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
S359.041	Northland Regional Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	There are potential effects associated with carbon farming such as lack of fire breaks, closer planting spaces and resulting difficulty in pest management as well as those normally associated with production forestry such as amenity and visual effects, wilding pine and fire risk.	Amend the Plan to consider including controls on exotic carbon forestry within the coastal environment, natural character areas, ONFL and areas of elite soils to protect the values of these resources and to manage nuisance such as shading, plant pest spread and fire risk.		Accept in part
FS108.7	Manulife Forest Management		Oppose	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.1077	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.502	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1091	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1113	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The NES PF already has rules in place to address these concerns. Adding further rules would be onerous and provide a lack of clarity.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S483.157	Top Energy Limited	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	In terms of 'How the Plan Works', it is unclear how this Chapter interacts with other District Wide Chapters. Based on the exclusion of a catch all discretionary activity status for rules not otherwise specified it is assumed that, for any activity not specified, the default activity status is permitted. This should be clarified in the Chapter itself	Amend to provide clarity around interrelationship between chapters.		Reject
FS196.216	Joe Carr		Support	this is important. FNDC with it's extensive knowledge should not rel on catch all tricks	Allow		Reject
FS345.208	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	this is important. FNDC with it's extensive knowledge should not rel on catch all tricks	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Reject
S511.078	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	This chapter only deals with ONLs and ONFs. It also only deals with ONF and ONLS outside the coastal environment. This chapter would also be more appropriately identified as "Outstanding natural features and landscapes" to avoid confusion as to the scope of the chapter which is different to the Natural character chapter.	Amend chapter title "Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Landscapes"		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS164.078	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject
FS570.1649	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.1663	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby	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
				recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.			
FS569.1685	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S436.005	Northland Fish and Game Council	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Not Stated	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m²) is already controlled by the	Insert provisions that provide for the building of maimai on wetlands or near a lake or river as a permitted activity.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.			
FS570.1469	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m ²) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.091	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m ²) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	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
FS566.1483	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m ²) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1505	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The right to build, tag and use maimai is a fundamental part of duck hunting in New Zealand and managing this activity is a core function of NFGC. NFGC enforces the relevant legislation that regulates maimai use in the field (Wildlife Act, 1953, Wildlife Regulations 1955). A wide range of structures are used as maimai, including permanent and temporary structures. Such structures are accepted around much of New Zealand as a permitted activity. The maximum floor size for maimai (10m ²) is already controlled by the Building Act 2004 under s41(1)b and Schedule 1(3). Maimai need to be of adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not to compromise hunter safety.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S442.097	Kapiro Conservation Trust	General / Plan Content / Miscellaneous	Support in part	This chapter only deals with ONLs and ONFs. It also only deals with ONF and ONLS outside the coastal environment. This chapter would also be more appropriately identified as "Outstanding natural features and landscapes" to avoid confusion as to the scope of the	Amend the title of the chapter: "Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Landscapes"		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				chapter which is different to the Natural character chapter.			
FS346.708	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S355.018	Wakaia Dalton	Overview	Support in part	We are concerned that the overview section of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter (EIB Chapter) does not contain or reflect the role of tangata whenua as kaitiaki over existing forests/bush that exist on their whenua. As detailed in the overview, there are large tracts of indigenous vegetation that exist of whenua Māori or land owned by Māori that are being managed and protected in accordance with Māori cultural values such as manaakitanga that is in line with tikanga and mātauranga Māori whereby tangata are exercising their role as kaitiaki. We are concerned that FNDC are proceeding with provisions that relate and reference Significant Natural Area's without undertaking the necessary engagement with tangata whenua. This is in direct conflict with the directions outlined in the exposure draft for the Natural and Built Environment Act and draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB).	Amend the overview to recognise and provide for tangata whenua as kaitiaki, acknowledging that tikanga and mātauranga Māori play a central role in how tangata whenua manage this resource.		Awaiting recommendation
S183.006	MLP LLC	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S226.006	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S227.006	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S228.006	Jayesh Govind and Others	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S229.006	Laurie Pearson	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S231.006	Ovisnegra Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S232.006	Tobias Groser	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S233.006	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S234.006	Whale Bay Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S235.006	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S236.006	Connemara Black Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S237.006	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S238.006	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S239.006	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S240.006	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S241.006	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S352.006	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).		
S333.025	P S Yates Family Trust	Overview	Support in part	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. ~~Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology~~	Accept
S168.033	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Overview	Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. ~~Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.~~	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.		
S187.026	The Shooting Box Limited	Overview	Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past.	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. ~~Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.~~	Accept
S422.006	Maurice Dabbah	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation farming activities.	Reject
S423.006	Bernard Sabrier	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S222.033	Wendover Two Limited	Overview	Support in part	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. ~~Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.~~	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.		
S434.006	Francois Dotta	Overview	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S435.006	Elka Gouzer	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Reject
S167.030	Bentzen Farm Limited	Overview	Oppose	The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and stories. ~~Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.~~	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.5	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Allow		Accept
FS566.392	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Disallow		Reject
S421.150	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Overview	Oppose	While Federated Farmers supports the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes, it considers that this must be done through the appropriate identification of the features and landscapes as well as with consultation with the impacted landowners who are the ones with the role of protecting such areas. Rural landowners are generally the ones who have preserved the landscapes and features on their properties around their working rural environment which is why such areas still exist today. If it was not for the landowners and the ability to graze around such areas the land would not be economically viable resulting in inappropriate subdivision, use and development to fund such land ownership. Federated Farmers strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features. Farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance.	Amend the Overview to recognise and acknowledge the role that landowners have played and still play in the preservation of outstanding natural landscapes and features		Accept
FS143.58	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities	Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.			
FS196.174	Joe Carr		Support	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Allow		Accept
FS285.11	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS570.1382	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and	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
				natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.			
FS346.384	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1396	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1418	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The further submitter also strongly opposes restricting farming activities within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and agrees with the primary submitter that farming activities are appropriate land use activities that still preserves the character and amenity value of such areas of significance. Mataka Station is an example of this, where landscape, biodiversity and natural character values have been significantly enhanced alongside farming operations.	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
S511.079	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Overview	Support in part	There is need to clarify that natural landscapes and features within the coastal environment which are not identified as ONL or ONF are addressed through provisions in the Coastal environment chapter.	Amend the overview to clarify that Coastal Environment cover landscapes and natural features that are not outstanding		Reject
FS164.079	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject
FS570.1650	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
FS566.1664	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1686	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject
S243.048	Matauri Trustee Limited	Overview	Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal.	Amend the Overview as follows: The Far North District has an extensive coastline with many harbours, large tracts of indigenous vegetation and a wide variety of natural processes that operate at varying scales. This has created a District rich in unique landscapes and features. In many instances, they are celebrated by cultural associations and		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	stories. Modification of these places has been minimal largely due to their remote locations, historic heritage and in some cases challenging topography and geomorphology.		
FS570.606	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS566.620	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs,	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
				logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.			
FS569.642	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) account for approximately 22% of the Far North District's land area. Of this, a significant portion has been highly modified in the past. The Overview incorrectly identifies that modification of ONLs has been minimal. Large tracts of ONLs are highly modified from their natural state by land uses including historical settlement, burn-offs, logging, forestry and farming practices. In many Instances the characteristics of the ONL are in fact defined by these previous or current land uses. The Overview as written sets up an incorrect expectation that ONLs as mapped are in a natural state. The objective is also internally Inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which correctly Recognises that farming is part of ONLs.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S442.098	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Overview	Support in part	There is need to clarify that natural landscapes and features within the coastal environment which are not identified as ONL or ONF are addressed through provisions in the Coastal environment chapter.	Amend the overview to clarify that Coastal Environment cover landscapes and natural features that are not outstanding.		Reject
FS346.709	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 other than where the relief	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S230.006	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Overview	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Overview of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Reject
FS566.565	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
S183.007	MLP LLC	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part
S226.007	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part
S227.007	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Trustee Company Limited			not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S228.007	Jayesh Govind and Others	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S229.007	Laurie Pearson	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S231.007	Ovisnagra Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S232.007	Tobias Groser	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S233.007	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S234.007	Whale Bay Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	R Accept in part
S235.007	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S236.007	Connemara Black Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S237.007	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S238.007	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S239.007	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S240.007	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	
S241.007	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S352.007	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S422.007	Maurice Dabbah	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings./structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S423.007	Bernard Sabrier	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S345.009	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Objectives	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	Accept in part
S425.033	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Objectives	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Accept in part
S434.007	Francois Dotta	Objectives	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S435.007	Elka Gouzer	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S179.076	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Objectives	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain objectives		Accept in part
FS51.96	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.039	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S230.007	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Objectives	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose	Amend the Objectives of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).			
FS566.566	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 in part
S421.151	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-01	Support in part	Objective NFL-O1 needs to be more aligned with section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The section requires the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. It would be better for the objective to be consistent with the section so that it recognises that certain activities may be undertaken in the landscape or feature but are still considered appropriate for that specified area. If objective NFL-O1 is amended, there is no need to retain objective NFL-O2.	Amend Objective NFL-O1 as follows: ~~ONL and ONF are identified and managed to ensure their long-term protection for current and future generations.~~ Outstanding natural features and landscapes that are important to the identity of the District are retained and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. or wording with similar intent		Accept in part
FS196.172	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.173	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS354.124	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	tautoko	Allow	Allow S421.151	Accept in part
FS534.034	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1383	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.385	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1397	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1419	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S67.005	Michael John Winch	NFL-01	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain objectives		Accept in part
FS570.040	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.828	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.054	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.031	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-02 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is ~~consistent with and~~ does not compromise the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part
FS143.6	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.			
FS547.034	Heron Point Limited		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.035	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS534.035	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and	Allow	Amend NFL-O2	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.			
FS566.393	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS354.286	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The resource consents granted to Mataka have confirmed that subdivision, land use and development can occur without compromising the characteristics and values of ONLs and can in fact enhance them.	Allow		Accept in part
S421.152	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-02	Support in part	Objective NFL-O1 needs to be more aligned with section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991. The section requires the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. It would be better for the objective to be consistent with the section so that it recognises that certain activities may be undertaken in the landscape or feature but are still considered appropriate for that specified area. If objective NFL-O1 is amended, there is no need to retain objective NFL-O2.	Delete Objective NFL-O2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.171	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept
FS570.1384	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS346.386	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject
FS566.1398	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
FS569.1420	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S222.034	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is ~~consistent with~~ and does not compromise the identified characteristics and qualities values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part
FS393.020	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	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
FS547.037	Heron Point Limited		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.038	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission No 222.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S168.034	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-02 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is ~~consistent with~~ and does not compromise the identified characteristics and qualities values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part
FS547.035	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.036	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.027	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF ~~is consistent with and~~ does not compromise the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part
FS547.036	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.037	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S243.049	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-02	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is ~~consistent with and~~ does not compromise the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part
FS547.038	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.039	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.607	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.621	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.643	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.026	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-02	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Objective NFL-O2 as follows: Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF ~~is consistent with and~~ does not compromise the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of that landscape or feature. Or alternatively The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS547.039	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.040	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the alternative amendment sought by the submitters to Objective 2 - The identified characteristics and values of ONLs and ONFs are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S454.090	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-02	Not Stated	A consequential amendment to this policy is required to ensure that the FNPD gives effect to the NPSET as set out in the submission point on I-P2 above.	Amend objective NFL-02 as follows: Subject to I-Px , Land use and subdivision in ONL and ONF is consistent with and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of that landscape or feature.		Reject
FS346.035	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow in part	disallow the original submission	Accept
FS404.024	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.377	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject
S67.021	Michael John Winch	NFL-02	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain objectives		Accept in part
FS346.844	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.070	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
S67.022	Michael John Winch	NFL-03	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain objectives		Accept in part
FS346.845	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.071	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S394.035	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-03	Support	This assists in effecting s 6(e) RMA.	Retain Objective NFL-O3		Accept in part
FS588.035	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS363.035	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS538.035	Awhina Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS537.035	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS536.035	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS535.035	Dyrell Akavi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS533.035	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS532.035	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS531.035	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS530.035	Norma Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS529.035	Aaron Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS528.035	Erana Samuels		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS527.035	David Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS526.035	Michelle Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS525.035	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS524.035	Tania Morunga		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS523.035	Brett Larkin		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS522.035	Stacey Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS521.035	Marie Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS520.035	Maureen Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS519.035	Huia Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS518.035	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS517.035	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS516.035	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS515.035	Anaru Poharama		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS514.035	Robert Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS513.035	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS512.035	Ellen Appleby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS511.035	Cedric Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS510.035	Raniera Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS509.035	Clinton Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS508.035	Sana Ryan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS507.035	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS506.035	Selwyn Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS505.035	Thomson Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS504.035	Ngarei Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS503.035	Nina Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS502.035	Rebecca Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS501.035	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS500.035	Whetu Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS499.035	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS498.035	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS497.035	Tayla Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS496.035	Cheryl Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS495.035	Jasmine Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS494.035	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS493.035	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS492.035	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS491.035	Mark J Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS490.035	Julia Middleton		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS489.035	Josephine Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS487.035	Timothy Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS486.035	John Barry Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS485.035	Travis Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS483.035	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS482.035	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS481.035	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS480.035	Cheryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS479.035	Jacob Hohaia		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS478.035	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS477.035	Chase McIndoe		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS476.035	Jessica Solomon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS475.035	Marina Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS474.035	Steven Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS473.035	Beryl Chase		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS472.035	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS471.035	William Gary Butt		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS470.035	Michael Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS469.035	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS468.035	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS467.035	Carol Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS466.035	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS465.035	Rangimarie Muru		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS464.035	Glennis Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS463.035	Jayden Murray		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS462.035	Roharia Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS461.035	Vincent C Matiu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS460.035	Tawhai Motu		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS459.035	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS458.035	Alexander John Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS457.035	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS456.035	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS455.035	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS454.035	Turei John Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS453.035	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS452.035	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS451.035	Ariana Bellingham		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS450.035	Georgina Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS447.035	Rangaunu Taua		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS440.035	Hongi Laing		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS439.035	Rahera Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS436.035	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS435.035	George Hori Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS434.035	Anthony Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS433.035	Christian Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS432.035	Makarita Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS431.035	Valarie Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS430.035	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS429.035	Cedrick Rutene		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS428.035	Shane Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS427.035	Jacey Horan		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS426.035	Toni Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS425.035	Florence Campbell		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS423.035	Joseph Maheno		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS422.035	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS421.035	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS420.035	Josephine Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS418.035	Mary Watkins		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS417.035	Maddison Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS416.035	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS415.035	Michelle Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS408.035	Jason Gardiner		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS388.035	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS387.035	Aroha Whitinui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS386.035	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS385.035	Victoria Murphy		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS382.035	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS381.035	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS380.035	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS379.035	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS378.035	Maanu Reihana		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS365.035	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS360.035	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS359.035	Mark Brannen		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS358.035	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS357.035	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS356.035	Katharine Kino		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS568.035	Bonnie Hepi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS567.035	Blaze Maraki		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS563.035	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS562.035	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS561.035	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS560.035	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS559.035	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS558.035	Timothy John Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS557.035	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS556.035	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	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
FS555.035	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS553.035	Kenape Saupese		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS552.035	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS551.035	Alamein Drummond		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS546.035	Shona Hetaraka		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS545.035	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS544.035	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS178.035	Hera Johns		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS413.035	Charles Lawrence		Support	I support the entire submission to protect waahi tapu site of significance and rights of tangata whenua	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S183.008	MLP LLC	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Landing Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Landing Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S226.008	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S227.008	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S228.008	Jayesh Govind and Others	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S229.008	Laurie Pearson	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S231.008	Ovisnegra Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S232.008	Tobias Groser	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S233.008	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S234.008	Whale Bay Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S235.008	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S236.008	Connemara Black Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S237.008	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S238.008	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S239.008	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S240.008	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S241.008	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S352.008	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S333.034	P S Yates Family Trust	Policies	Not Stated	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native plating regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation	Insert a new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.	Accept in part
S168.042	Setar Thirty Six Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native plating regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation	Insert a new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S187.034	The Shooting Box Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.	Insert a new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.	Accept in part
S422.008	Maurice Dabbah	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S423.008	Bernard Sabrier	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.	Accept in part
S345.010	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Policies	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property,	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	
S425.034	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Policies	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Reject
S222.042	Wendover Two Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.	Insert a new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.	Accept in part
S434.008	Francois Dotta	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		
S435.008	Elka Gouzer	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part
S431.161	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: That the cumulative effect of changes to the character of Outstanding Landscapes be taken into account in assessing applications for resource consent.		Accept in part
FS67.69	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.101	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS143.47	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.100	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.98	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.101	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.180	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS332.161	Russell Protection Society		Support	The policy sought on consideration of cumulative effects is at best a matter of discretion, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S167.039	Bentzen Farm Limited	Policies	Oppose	The Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits.	Insert a new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.		Accept in part
FS143.12	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits of such forms of subdivision and development.	Allow		Accept in part
FS354.125	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such	Allow	Allow S167.039	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits of such forms of subdivision and development.			
FS566.401	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter fully agrees with this submission point that the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision and Mataka Station is a case in point. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, and as at Mataka Station, subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits of such forms of subdivision and development.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S431.162	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: That the visibility of Outstanding Landscape Features, when viewed from public places, be taken into account in assessing applications for resource consent		Accept in part
FS67.70	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.102	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.48	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS143.49	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.101	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.99	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.102	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.181	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS332.162	Russell Protection Society		Support	The policy sought on consideration public views is at best a matter of discretion or simply a matter of good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S431.163	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: That activities avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the scientific and amenity values associated with outstanding natural features.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS67.71	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.71	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.69	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.103	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS332.163	Russell Protection Society		Support	Does not give effect to the RPS or the NZCPS, which do not specify the requirement sought in this submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S431.164	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: That the high value of indigenous vegetation to Outstanding Landscapes be taken into account when assessing applications for resource consents.		Reject
FS67.72	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS67.103	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS143.50	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.72	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.102	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS69.70	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS66.104	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.182	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS332.164	Russell Protection Society		Support	The change sought is at best a matter of discretion or good landscape assessment practice, not a policy.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S394.039	Haititaimarangai Marae Kaitiaki Trust	Policies	Oppose	Adverse effects on cultural values must be managed appropriately as a part of any subdivision, not just considered.	Insert a new policy as follows: Avoid any significant adverse cultural effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate any other adverse cultural effects.		Reject
FS67.104	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS68.103	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS69.100	Setar Thirty Six Limited		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS66.183	Bentzen Farm Limited		Oppose	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS588.039	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS363.039	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS538.039	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS537.039	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS536.039	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS535.039	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS533.039	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS532.039	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS531.039	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS530.039	Norma Evans		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS529.039	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS528.039	Erana Samuels		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS527.039	David Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS526.039	Michelle Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS525.039	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS524.039	Tania Morunga		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS523.039	Brett Larkin		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS522.039	Stacey Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS521.039	Marie Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS520.039	Maureen Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS519.039	Huia Solomon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS518.039	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS517.039	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS516.039	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS515.039	Anaru Poharama		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS514.039	Robert Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS513.039	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS512.039	Ellen Appleby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS511.039	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS510.039	Raniera Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS509.039	Clinton Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS508.039	Sana Ryan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS507.039	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS506.039	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS505.039	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS504.039	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS503.039	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS502.039	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS501.039	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS500.039	Whetu Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS499.039	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS498.039	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS497.039	Tayla Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS496.039	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS495.039	Jasmine Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS494.039	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS493.039	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS492.039	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS491.039	Mark J Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS490.039	Julia Middleton		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS489.039	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS487.039	Timothy Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS486.039	John Barry Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS485.039	Travis Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS483.039	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS482.039	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS481.039	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS480.039	Cheryl Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS479.039	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS478.039	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS477.039	Chase McIndoe		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS476.039	Jessica Solomon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS475.039	Marina Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS474.039	Steven Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS473.039	Beryl Chase		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS472.039	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS471.039	William Gary Butt		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS470.039	Michael Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS469.039	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS468.039	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS467.039	Carol Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS466.039	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS465.039	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS464.039	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS463.039	Jayden Murray		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS462.039	Roharia Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS461.039	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS460.039	Tawhai Motu		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS459.039	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS458.039	Alexander John Busby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS457.039	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS456.039	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS455.039	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS454.039	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS453.039	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS452.039	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS451.039	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS450.039	Georgina Laing		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS447.039	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS440.039	Hongi Laing		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS439.039	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS436.039	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS435.039	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS434.039	Anthony Murphy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS433.039	Christian Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS432.039	Makarita Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS431.039	Valarie Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS430.039	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS429.039	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS428.039	Shane Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS427.039	Jacey Horan		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS426.039	Toni Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS425.039	Florence Campbell		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS423.039	Joseph Maheno		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS422.039	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS421.039	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS420.039	Josephine Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS418.039	Mary Watkins		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS417.039	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS416.039	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS415.039	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS408.039	Jason Gardiner		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS388.039	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS387.039	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS386.039	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS385.039	Victoria Murphy		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS382.039	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS381.039	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS380.039	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS379.039	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS378.039	Maanu Reihana		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS365.039	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS360.039	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS359.039	Mark Brannen		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS358.039	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the	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
				changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS357.039	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS356.039	Katharine Kino		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS568.039	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the	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
				obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS567.039	Blaze Maraki		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS563.039	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS562.039	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in	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
				a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS561.039	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS560.039	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS559.039	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional	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
				policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS558.039	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS557.039	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS556.039	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	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
FS555.039	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS553.039	Kenape Saupese		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS552.039	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS551.039	Alamein Drummond		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs	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
				"Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS546.039	Shona Hetaraka		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS545.039	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS544.039	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken	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
				into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.			
FS178.039	Hera Johns		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS413.039	Charles Lawrence		Support	Under Appendix 1 of the RPS which has directed the identification of ONLs "Spiritual, cultural and historical associations" should have been taken into account already and described as a value for each ONL. Subject to the changes sought by the further submitter in its submission point on NFL-O2, the obligation will be that these values are not compromised, and then managed in a way consistent with the policies which follow. For this reason, the additional policy sought by the submitter is not necessary.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S431.165	John Andrew Riddell	Policies	Not Stated	The amendment is necessary in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.	Insert the following new policy: That landscape values be protected by encouraging development that takes in account: (a) the rarity or value of the landscape and/or landscape features; (b) the visibility of the development; (c) important views as seen from public vantage points on a public		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					road, public reserve, the foreshore and the coastal marine area; (d) the desirability of avoiding adverse effects on the elements that contribute to the distinctive character of the coastal landscapes, especially outstanding landscapes and natural features, ridges and headlands or those features that have significant amenity value; (e) the contribution of natural patterns, composition and extensive cover of indigenous vegetation to landscape values; (f) Maori cultural values associated with landscapes; (g) the importance of the activity in enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being.		
FS143.51	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances landscape and natural character values.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS66.105	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support in part	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances landscape and natural character values.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS332.165	Russell Protection Society		Support	The part of the relief sought that recognises that landscape values may be protected by encouraging development of a certain type is supported. Mataka Station is an example of subdivision and development that protects and enhances landscape and natural character values.	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
S179.077	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Policies	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain policies		Accept in part
FS51.97	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.040	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S243.057	Matauri Trustee Limited	Policies	Oppose	As drafted, the Proposed Plan does not provide appropriate recognition of existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development in ONLs and ONFs. Many values and characteristics of ONLs have been enhanced through development and subdivision through for example native planting regeneration and its ongoing protection. Such activities have been deemed to be appropriate in the past and in the more recent past, typically subject to legally binding ongoing obligations to protect and enhance the values which comprise the ONL or ONF. A new policy is required to recognise the positive benefits that can	Insert new policy as follows: Recognise that identified ONLs and ONFs may contain existing and/or authorised subdivision, use and development and provide for these activities.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				accrue from such activities and enable their continuation.			
FS401.018	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.615	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.629	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.651	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S230.008	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Policies	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend the Policies of the Natural features and landscapes chapter to recognise the proposed Mataka Station Precinct provisions and the existing resource consent which provides for dwellings and buildings/structures on the Lots within the Mataka Scheme as well as the continuation of farming activities.		Accept in part
FS566.567	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Oppose to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Disallow	Accept in part	Accept in part
S356.070	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NFL-P1	Support	not stated	Retain NFL-P1 as notified		Accept
S67.006	Michael John Winch	NFL-P1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the policies		Accept
FS346.829	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS566.055	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject
S167.032	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS143.7	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Allow		Accept in part
FS547.040	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS305.041	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS566.394	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated in relation to the objective above.	Disallow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S421.153	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-P2	Support in part	333.031	Amend Policy NFL-P2 to achieve consistency with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and to recognise the need to allow appropriate subdivision, use and development		Reject
FS143.59	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow		Reject
FS196.169	Joe Carr		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow		Reject
FS196.170	Joe Carr		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow		Reject
FS165.3	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow in part		Reject
FS272.4	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Allow in part		Reject
FS534.036	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.			
FS570.1385	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.387	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1399	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1421	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that the Natural Features and Landscape policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S394.036	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P2	Support	This neatly implements s 6(b) RMA.	Retain Policy NFL-P2		Accept
FS588.036	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept
FS285.6	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support		Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS363.036	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS538.036	Awhina Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS537.036	Maryanne June Harrison		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS536.036	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS535.036	Dyrell Akavi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS533.036	Sidney John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS532.036	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS531.036	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS530.036	Norma Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS529.036	Aaron Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS528.036	Erana Samuels		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS527.036	David Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS526.036	Michelle Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS525.036	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS524.036	Tania Morunga		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS523.036	Brett Larkin		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS522.036	Stacey Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS521.036	Marie Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS520.036	Maureen Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS519.036	Huia Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS518.036	William Boyd Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS517.036	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS516.036	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS515.036	Anaru Poharama		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS514.036	Robert Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS513.036	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS512.036	Ellen Appleby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS511.036	Cedric Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS510.036	Raniera Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS509.036	Clinton Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS508.036	Sana Ryan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS507.036	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS506.036	Selwyn Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS505.036	Thomson Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS504.036	Ngarei Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS503.036	Nina Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS502.036	Rebecca Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS501.036	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS500.036	Whetu Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS499.036	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS498.036	Aaron George Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS497.036	Tayla Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS496.036	Cheryl Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS495.036	Jasmine Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS494.036	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS493.036	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS492.036	Sarah Kati Cook		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS491.036	Mark J Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS490.036	Julia Middleton		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS489.036	Josephine Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS487.036	Timothy Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS486.036	John Barry Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS485.036	Travis Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS483.036	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS482.036	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS481.036	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS480.036	Cheryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS479.036	Jacob Hohaia		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS478.036	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS477.036	Chase McIndoe		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS476.036	Jessica Solomon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS475.036	Marina Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS474.036	Steven Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS473.036	Beryl Chase		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS472.036	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS471.036	William Gary Butt		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS470.036	Michael Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS469.036	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS468.036	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS467.036	Carol Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS466.036	Janet Myra Bennett		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS465.036	Rangimarie Muru		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS464.036	Glennis Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS463.036	Jayden Murray		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS462.036	Roharia Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS461.036	Vincent C Matiu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS460.036	Tawhai Motu		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS459.036	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS458.036	Alexander John Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS457.036	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS456.036	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS455.036	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS454.036	Turei John Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS453.036	Marlaine Ulrich		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS452.036	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS451.036	Ariana Bellingham		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS450.036	Georgina Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS447.036	Rangaunu Taua		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS440.036	Hongi Laing		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS439.036	Rahera Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS436.036	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS435.036	George Hori Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS434.036	Anthony Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS433.036	Christian Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS432.036	Makarita Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS431.036	Valarie Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS430.036	Kaeo Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS429.036	Cedrick Rutene		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS428.036	Shane Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS427.036	Jacey Horan		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS426.036	Toni Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS425.036	Florence Campbell		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS423.036	Joseph Maheno		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS422.036	Sharmaine Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS421.036	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS420.036	Josephine Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS418.036	Mary Watkins		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS417.036	Maddison Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS416.036	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS415.036	Michelle Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS408.036	Jason Gardiner		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS388.036	Crystal Myra Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS387.036	Aroha Whitinui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS386.036	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS385.036	Victoria Murphy		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS382.036	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS381.036	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS380.036	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS379.036	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS378.036	Maanu Reihana		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS365.036	Roberta Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS360.036	Cameron Mccaskill		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS359.036	Mark Brannen		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS358.036	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatipi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS357.036	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS356.036	Katharine Kino		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS568.036	Bonnie Hepi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS567.036	Blaze Maraki		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS563.036	Hohepa Fletcher		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS562.036	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS561.036	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS560.036	Dylan Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS559.036	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS558.036	Timothy John Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS557.036	Patricia Kate Broad		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS556.036	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS555.036	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS553.036	Kenape Saupese		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS552.036	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS551.036	Alamein Drummond		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS546.036	Shona Hetaraka		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS545.036	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS544.036	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS178.036	Hera Johns		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
FS413.036	Charles Lawrence		Support		Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept
S168.035	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.			
FS547.041	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS305.042	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		
S187.028	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Accept in part
FS547.042	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of	Disallow in part	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.			
FS305.043	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S222.035	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P2	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS547.043	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.			
FS305.044	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S243.050	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P2	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.			
FS547.044	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS305.045	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.608	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.622	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.644	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.027	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P2	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements	Amend Policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.			
FS547.045	Heron Point Limited		Oppose	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Disallow in part		Accept in part
FS305.046	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to the wording. The submitter considers that the policy should be revised to include provision to remedy or mitigate effects to account for circumstances where adverse effects on the characteristics and values of ONL or ONF cannot be avoided. The suggested wording is: Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and values of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S454.091	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-P2	Not Stated	A consequential amendment to this policy is required to ensure that the FNPDP gives effect to the NPSET as set out in the submission point on I-P2 above.	Amend policy NFL-P2 as follows: Avoid adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF within the coastal environment, subject to Policy I-Px.		Reject
FS346.036	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept
FS404.025	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.378	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject
S67.023	Michael John Winch	NFL-P2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS346.846	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.072	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.033	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set			
FS143.8	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow		Accept in part
FS547.046	Heron Point Limited		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.047	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS566.395	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S421.154	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-P3	Support in part	Policies NFL-P2, NFL-P3 and NFL-P7 need to be amended so that they are consistent with the relief sought by Federated Farmers for objectives NFL-O1 and NFL-O2 above. The policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the two layers while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 to achieve consistency with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991 and to recognise the need to allow appropriate subdivision, use and development		Reject
FS196.168	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Reject
FS165.4	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	tautoko	Allow in part		Reject
FS272.5	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich		Support in part	tautoko	Allow in part		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS534.037	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	tautoko	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
FS570.1386	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS346.388	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS566.1400	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
FS569.1422	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept
S394.037	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P3	Support in part	A number of characteristics or qualities may count towards a site qualifying as ONF or ONL. It is important that adverse effects are appropriately addressed with respect to each characteristic or quality to ensure protection on the round, as required by s 6(b) RMA.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on any of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS588.037	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS285.7	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS363.037	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS538.037	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS537.037	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS536.037	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS535.037	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS533.037	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS532.037	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS531.037	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS530.037	Norma Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS529.037	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS528.037	Erana Samuels		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS527.037	David Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS526.037	Michelle Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS525.037	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS524.037	Tania Morunga		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS523.037	Brett Larkin		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS522.037	Stacey Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS521.037	Marie Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS520.037	Maureen Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS519.037	Huia Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS518.037	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS517.037	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS516.037	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS515.037	Anaru Poharama		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS514.037	Robert Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS513.037	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS512.037	Ellen Appleby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS511.037	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS510.037	Raniera Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS509.037	Clinton Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS508.037	Sana Ryan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS507.037	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS506.037	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS505.037	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS504.037	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS503.037	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS502.037	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS501.037	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS500.037	Whetu Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS499.037	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS498.037	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS497.037	Tayla Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS496.037	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS495.037	Jasmine Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS494.037	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS493.037	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS492.037	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS491.037	Mark J Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS490.037	Julia Middleton		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS489.037	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS487.037	Timothy Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS486.037	John Barry Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS485.037	Travis Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS483.037	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS482.037	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS481.037	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS480.037	Cheryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS479.037	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS478.037	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS477.037	Chase McIndoe		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS476.037	Jessica Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS475.037	Marina Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS474.037	Steven Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS473.037	Beryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS472.037	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS471.037	William Gary Butt		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS470.037	Michael Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS469.037	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS468.037	Elias Reihana-Hetarakā		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS467.037	Carol Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS466.037	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS465.037	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS464.037	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS463.037	Jayden Murray		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS462.037	Roharia Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS461.037	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS460.037	Tawhai Motu		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS459.037	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS458.037	Alexander John Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS457.037	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS456.037	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS455.037	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS454.037	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS453.037	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS452.037	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS451.037	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS450.037	Georgina Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS447.037	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS440.037	Hongi Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS439.037	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS436.037	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS435.037	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS434.037	Anthony Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS433.037	Christian Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS432.037	Makarita Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS431.037	Valarie Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS430.037	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS429.037	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS428.037	Shane Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS427.037	Jacey Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS426.037	Toni Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS425.037	Florence Campbell		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS423.037	Joseph Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS422.037	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS421.037	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS420.037	Josephine Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS418.037	Mary Watkins		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS417.037	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS416.037	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS415.037	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS408.037	Jason Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS388.037	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS387.037	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS386.037	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS385.037	Victoria Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS382.037	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS381.037	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS380.037	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS379.037	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS378.037	Maanu Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS365.037	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS360.037	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS359.037	Mark Brannen		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS358.037	Kailah Raharuhi - Alatiipi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS357.037	Raharuhi Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS356.037	Katharine Kino		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS568.037	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS567.037	Blaze Maraki		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS563.037	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS562.037	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS561.037	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS560.037	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS559.037	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS558.037	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS557.037	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS556.037	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS555.037	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS553.037	Kenape Saupese		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced	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
				evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.			
FS552.037	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS551.037	Alamein Drummond		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS546.037	Shona Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS545.037	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS544.037	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS178.037	Hera Johns		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS413.037	Charles Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed, however, text amendment sought does not appear to allow for the balanced evaluation, overall evaluation. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S168.036	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives and policy set.	~~qualities~~ values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		
FS547.047	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.048	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S187.098	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and ~~qualities~~ values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.			
FS547.048	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.050	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S222.036	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P3	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS547.050	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.051	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S243.051	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P3	Oppose	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (i.e. allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and qualities values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Accept in part
FS547.051	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.052	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.609	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.623	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.645	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.028	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P3	Support in part	By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an	Amend Policy NFL-P3 as follows: Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the identified characteristics and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.	qualities-values of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment		
FS547.052	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Amend	Accept in part
FS305.054	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 3 subject to drafting.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S454.092	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-P3	Not Stated	A consequential amendment to this policy is required to ensure that the FNPDP gives effect to the NPSET as set out in the submission point on I-P2 above.	Amend policy NFL-P3 (inferred) as follows: Subject to I-Px , Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of land use and subdivision on the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF outside the coastal environment.		Reject
FS346.037	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow in part	Disallow the original submission	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS404.026	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept
FS369.379	Top Energy		Support	Amendments sought are inappropriate to recognise and provide for s6(b) matters	Allow	Amend	Reject
S67.024	Michael John Winch	NFL-P3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS346.847	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.073	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.029	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-Q2	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature		Accept in part
S168.037	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					established the landscape or feature; and ...	
S222.037	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.	Accept in part
S167.034	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. By its nature, land use and subdivision cannot be 'consistent with' the characteristics and qualities of an ONL or ONF: those being defined by a current state. It can however not compromise their characteristics and values as have been identified by the higher order planning documents. The NRC Landscape Assessment Work Sheets refer to "values" not qualities. In order for this objective to be the most appropriate way to achieve the requirements of the RMA and give effect to the NPS (ie allow a measurable assessment), it should use the same language as the Landscape Assessment methodology. "Identified" characteristics has been correctly used in policy NFL-P5, allowing a more measurable test of compliance with the policy. This should	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be consistently used thoroughly this objectives ad policy set.			
FS143.9	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.396	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	For the reasons stated above in relation to the objective	Disallow		Accept in part
S148.027	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	NFL-P4	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF. Policy NFL-P4 seeks to grandparent an existing land use that may be or could become unsustainable both in terms of economic and environmental effects. The Plan should allow for all primary production activities subject to managing any adverse effects.	Amend NPFL-P4 to read "Provide for primary production activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature." and		Accept in part
FS85.21	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Allow		Accept in part
FS108.15	Manulife Forest Management		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.				
FS354.126	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Allow	Allow S148.027	Accept in part	
FS346.533	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.139	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The NFL-P4 lacks fairness in treating various primary production endeavours. Specifically, it overlooks the notion that established plantation forestry within an ONL or ONF should be acknowledged as a valid component of the surroundings. This recognition should extend to permitting such activity while adhering to the guidelines of the NES-	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				PF. It also shows an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.				
S160.021	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy NFL-P4 and considers the policy to be very subjective and can be interpreted in many ways, and that including only farming and not all primary production is not fair or equitable.	Amend policy as follows: Provide for primary production activities within ONL and on ONF where: 1. the use forms part of the characteristics and qualities that established the landscape or feature; and 2. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature. to provide for primary production activities within ONL and ONF.		Accept in part	
FS85.22	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife Forest Management's submission that narrowing the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS346.591	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which 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. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S67.025	Michael John Winch	NFL-P4	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS85.23	PF Olsen Ltd		Oppose	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Disallow		Accept in part
FS346.848	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.074	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule NPFL-P4 narrows the land use to only farms is a grandparenting rule, and Councils should avoid it as it is unfair to the other land users.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S159.060	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-P4	Oppose	The policy only provides for farming (including horticulture) in limited circumstances. Given the extent of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes in the Far North this is limiting	Amend Policy NFL-P4 to include an additional clause: c) the activity is an existing land use		Accept in part
FS151.224	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS346.009	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.222	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						original submission		
FS566.236	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.258	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S91.010	PF Olsen Limited	NFL-P4	Oppose	Policy NFL-P4 is an unacceptable form of grandparenting existing land use, favouring one form of primary production over others.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 to apply to all primary production activities.		Accept	
FS548.020	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an outstanding natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept	
FS404.001	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an outstanding natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.	Disallow	disallow original submission	Accept	
FS566.099	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Federated Farmers supports the policy as notified. It is appropriate that some primary production activities are not allowed to occur within an outstanding	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission	Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				natural feature or landscape given the potential for these activities to have a great impact on the environment.		is inconsistent with our original submission	
S198.001	Thomson Survey Ltd	NFL-P4	Oppose	The submitter opposes NFL-P4 and contends that making any kind of farming within an ONL or ONF a discretionary activity is unjustified, unacceptable and unreasonable.	Delete NFL-P4		Accept in part
FS332.220	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	Making farming a discretionary activity in coastal areas is entirely appropriate.	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S187.029	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature.	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.		Accept in part
FS305.049	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	Need to avoid significant effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
S243.052	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P4	Support in part	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with	Amend Policy NFL-P4 as follows: Provide for farming activities within ONL and on ONF where: a. the use forms part of the identified characteristics and qualities values that		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	established the landscape or feature; and b. the use is consistent with, and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.		
FS570.610	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.624	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.646	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The policy provides appropriate recognition that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. Changes are sought in line with reasons for submission point on NFL-O2	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S333.030	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					identified characteristics and qualities values .	
S168.038	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values	Accept in part
S187.030	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values .	Accept in part
S222.038	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values .	Accept in part
S559.025	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rēhia	NFL-P5	Support in part	There is no guarantee the land given back would have a known 'ancestral use' and dictating how we can utilise our treaty settlement land is contrary SD-CP-O1. It needs to be open to use and develop the land in a way that meets the aspirations of the landholders	Amend NFL-P5 as follows: 'Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ~~ancestral use of that~~ land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				without adverse effects on the natural features and landscapes.	qualities.' (inferred).		
FS151.333	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS23.271	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support		Allow	Allow the relief sought.	Accept in part
FS570.2215	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS348.052	Alec Brian Cox		Oppose		Disallow	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed	Accept in part
FS566.2229	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.2251	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support		Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S243.053	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				method to determine compliance with the policy.	Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values.		
FS570.611	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.625	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.647	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S67.026	Michael John Winch	NFL-P5	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS346.849	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought	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
				would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.			
FS566.075	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.035	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P5	Support in part	Support the use of 'identified' as has been used in this policy, but should be used elsewhere to allow a measurable method to determine compliance with the policy.	Amend Policy NFL-P5 as follows: Provide for the use of Māori Purpose zoned land and Treaty Settlement land in ONL and ONF where land use and subdivision is consistent with the ancestral use of that land and does not compromise any identified characteristics and qualities values .		Accept in part
FS566.397	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 in part
S333.031	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P6	Support	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF areas where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.		Accept in part
S168.039	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF areas where it is consistent		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					with the characteristics and qualities.		
S187.031	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF ~~areas where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.~~	Accept in part	
S222.039	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF ~~areas where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.~~	Accept in part	
S167.036	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF ~~areas where it is consistent with the characteristics and qualities.~~	Accept in part	
FS143.10	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that the restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged in objectives and policies and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.398	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees with this submission point that the restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged in objectives and policies and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow		Accept in part
S243.054	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P6	Support in part	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Amend Policy NFL-P6 as follows: Encourage the restoration and enhancement of ONL and ONF ~~areas where it is consistent~~	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					with the characteristics and qualities.		
FS570.612	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.626	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.648	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The restoration and enhancement of ONLs and ONF should always be encouraged and to do otherwise may hold such areas in a degraded state.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S67.027	Michael John Winch	NFL-P6	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS346.850	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.076	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.		submission is inconsistent with our original submission		
S167.037	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	
FS143.11	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow		Accept	
FS547.053	Heron Point Limited		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow	Delete Policy	Accept	
FS305.055	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	
FS566.399	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The policy prohibiting 'any loss' of characteristics of ONLs is an unreasonable test and does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
S421.155	Northland Federated	NFL-P7	Support in part	Policies NFL-P2, NFL-P3 and NFL-P7 need to be amended so that they are consistent with the relief sought by	Amend Policy NFL-P7 as follows: Prohibit inappropriate land use		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand			Federated Farmers for objectives NFL-O1 and NFL-O2 above. The policies need to focus on avoiding inappropriate subdivision, use and development within the two layers while recognising certain activities can occur as long as they are appropriate for the areas.	that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF or wording with similar intent		
FS196.167	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS534.038	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	tautoko	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.1387	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.389	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1401	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.1423	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						original submission		
S394.038	Haititaimarangi Marae Kaitiaki Trust	NFL-P7	Support in part	Largely support, though note that each characteristic or quality of ONL and ONF should attract protection to ensure protection on the round.	Amend Policy NFL-P7 as follows: Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of any of the characteristics and or qualities of ONL and or ONF.		Accept in part	
FS588.038	Ian Bamber		Support	Supports entire submission to protect our waahi tapu sites of significance and rights as tangata whenua.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	
FS285.8	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS363.038	Liz Rowena Maki Hetaraka.		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS538.038	Awhina Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS537.038	Maryanne June Harrison		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS536.038	Bradley Tauhara Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS535.038	Dyrell Akavi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS533.038	Sidney John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS532.038	Wiremu Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS531.038	Phyllis Marie Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS530.038	Norma Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS529.038	Aaron Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS528.038	Erana Samuels		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS527.038	David Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS526.038	Michelle Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS525.038	Vaughn Piripi Duvell Evans		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS524.038	Tania Morunga		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS523.038	Brett Larkin		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS522.038	Stacey Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS521.038	Marie Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS520.038	Maureen Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS519.038	Huia Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS518.038	William Boyd Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS517.038	Mereana Alma Houkamau		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS516.038	Rebecca Jan Stensness		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS515.038	Anaru Poharama		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS514.038	Robert Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS513.038	Ester Rangi Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS512.038	Ellen Appleby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS511.038	Cedric Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS510.038	Raniera Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS509.038	Clinton Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS508.038	Sana Ryan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS507.038	Te TeArani Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS506.038	Selwyn Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS505.038	Thomson Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS504.038	Ngarei Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS503.038	Nina Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS502.038	Rebecca Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS501.038	Patricia Ellen Buddy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS500.038	Whetu Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS499.038	Paki Daniel Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS498.038	Aaron George Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS497.038	Tayla Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS496.038	Cheryl Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS495.038	Jasmine Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS494.038	Ian Ethan Bamber		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS493.038	Albert Tawhio Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS492.038	Sarah Kati Cook		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS491.038	Mark J Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS490.038	Julia Middleton		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS489.038	Josephine Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS487.038	Timothy Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS486.038	John Barry Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS485.038	Travis Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS483.038	Mate Simon Covich Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS482.038	Waikura Maungaia Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS481.038	Peggy Joanne Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS480.038	Cheryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS479.038	Jacob Hohaia		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS478.038	Grayson Fleur Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS477.038	Chase McIndoe		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS476.038	Jessica Solomon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS475.038	Marina Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS474.038	Steven Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS473.038	Beryl Chase		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS472.038	Krystal-Jade Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS471.038	William Gary Butt		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS470.038	Michael Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS469.038	Anne-marie Morrissey		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS468.038	Elias Reihana-Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS467.038	Carol Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS466.038	Janet Myra Bennett		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS465.038	Rangimarie Muru		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS464.038	Glennis Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS463.038	Jayden Murray		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS462.038	Roharia Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS461.038	Vincent C Matiu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS460.038	Tawhai Motu		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS459.038	Maria Kim Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS458.038	Alexander John Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS457.038	Ena Lesley Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS456.038	Rhys Alexander Lawrence-Busby		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS455.038	Rangi Matthew Marriott		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS454.038	Turei John Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS453.038	Marlaine Ulrich		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS452.038	Reikura Joan Boyd		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS451.038	Ariana Bellingham		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS450.038	Georgina Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS447.038	Rangaunu Taua		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS440.038	Hongi Laing		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS439.038	Rahera Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS436.038	Parehuia Jane Williams		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS435.038	George Hori Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS434.038	Anthony Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS433.038	Christian Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS432.038	Makarita Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS431.038	Valarie Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS430.038	Kaeo Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS429.038	Cedrick Rutene		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS428.038	Shane Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS427.038	Jacey Horan		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS426.038	Toni Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS425.038	Florence Campbell		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS423.038	Joseph Maheno		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS422.038	Sharmaine Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS421.038	Gia-Dene Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS420.038	Josephine Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS418.038	Mary Watkins		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS417.038	Maddison Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS416.038	Isobel Fitzgibbon		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS415.038	Michelle Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS408.038	Jason Gardiner		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS388.038	Crystal Myra Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS387.038	Aroha Whitinui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS386.038	Tynan Hokimate Mark		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS385.038	Victoria Murphy		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS382.038	Yvonne Meta Desmond		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS381.038	Lorraine Joan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS380.038	Ashleigh Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS379.038	Kaya Hetaraka-Tawhai		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS378.038	Maanu Reihana		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS365.038	Roberta Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS360.038	Cameron Mccaskill		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS359.038	Mark Brannen		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS358.038	Kailah Rahuhi - Alatiapi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS357.038	Rahuhi Fiaui		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS356.038	Katharine Kino		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS568.038	Bonnie Hepi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS567.038	Blaze Maraki		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS563.038	Hohepa Fletcher		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS562.038	Rhonda Raharuhi		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS561.038	Ivan Wimoka Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS560.038	Dylan Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS559.038	Clinton Albert Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS558.038	Timothy John Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS557.038	Patricia Kate Broad		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS556.038	Louis Aluishis Brabant		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS555.038	Kelly Sharee Doyle		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS553.038	Kenape Saupese		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS552.038	Barbara May Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS551.038	Alamein Drummond		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS546.038	Shona Hetaraka		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an	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
				overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.				
FS545.038	Peter Charles Rupapera		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS544.038	Te Waata Lawrence Kara		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS178.038	Hera Johns		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS413.038	Charles Lawrence		Support	Agree with the sentiment, however protection of each characteristic (if that is what is intended) is an overstatement. Flexibility required. Amend text accordingly.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
S243.055	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the Characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value Should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	
FS401.017	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Reject	
FS547.055	Heron Point Limited		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Reject	
FS305.059	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	As detailed within the Original Submission	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Reject	
FS570.613	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
FS566.627	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
FS569.649	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	As detailed within the Original Submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
S168.040	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.				
FS547.054	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Accept	
FS305.056	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	
S333.032	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	
FS547.056	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7	Accept	
FS305.060	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	
S222.040	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS547.057	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7	Accept	
FS305.058	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	
S187.032	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P7	Oppose	Prohibit land use that would result in any loss of and/or destruction of the characteristics and qualities of ONL and ONF. Some loss of 'characteristics and qualities' should be able to be sustained before those values are gone. The classification system used by the NRC uses a ranking within which the value should be able to move along before it is lost. In this context prohibiting 'any loss' is an unreasonable test.	Delete Policy NFL-P7		Accept	
FS547.058	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P7.	Accept	
FS305.057	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept	
S67.028	Michael John Winch	NFL-P7	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Reject	
FS346.851	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
FS566.077	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent	Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.		with our original submission		
S356.071	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	NFL-P8	Support	not stated	Retain NFL-P8 as notified		Accept in part	
S167.038	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	
FS547.059	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)	Accept in part	
FS305.061	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	
FS534.039	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)	Accept in part	
FS566.400	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought	Disallow		Accept in part	
S168.041	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P8 (inferred) seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				an unspecified outcome as is this policy.			
FS547.060	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred).	Accept in part
FS305.062	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
S243.056	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P6 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part
FS547.061	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred).	Accept in part
FS305.065	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS570.614	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.628	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.650	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S333.033	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P6 seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	
FS547.062	Heron Point Limited		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete Policy NFL-	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						P8 (inferred).		
FS305.066	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	
S187.033	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: this is not a policy but a method of assessment, and more appropriately an assessment criterion; and non-complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against clear objectives and policies.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	
FS547.122	Heron Point Limited		Support	The Submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Delete policy NFL-P8	Accept in part	
FS305.063	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	The Submitter supports the decision sought.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part	
S222.041	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-P8	Oppose	Policy NFL-P8 (inferred) seeks to manage land use and subdivision to Protect ONL and ONF and address the effects of the activity requiring resource consent, including (but not limited to) consideration of a range of matters where relevant to the application: This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion. Non complying and discretionary activity applications should be assessed against objectives and policies which should be a clear expression of a desired outcome - not a way to achieve an unspecified outcome as is this policy.	Delete Policy NFL-P8 (inferred)		Accept in part	
FS305.064	Dempsey Family Trust		Support	This is not a policy but a method of assessment, and therefore more appropriately an assessment criterion.	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
S67.029	Michael John Winch	NFL-P8	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	Retain the policies		Accept in part
FS346.852	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.078	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S183.009	MLP LLC	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Landing Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Accept in part
S226.009	Tryphena Trustees Limited, David Haythornwaite	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S227.009	Isles Casey Trustee Services Limited, WWC Trustee Company Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S228.009	Jayesh Govind and Others	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S229.009	Laurie Pearson	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S231.009	Ovisnegra Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S232.009	Tobias Groser	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S233.009	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S234.009	Whale Bay Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S235.009	WW Trustee Services 2016 Limited, Eloise Caroline Caswell, Donald Gordon Chandler	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S236.009	Connemara Black Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S237.009	Evan Williams and Katherine Williams	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S238.009	John Gowing and Miriam Van Lith	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S239.009	John Gowing, Miriam Van Lith, Ellis Gowing, James Gowing, Byron Gowing	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S240.009	Matthew Watson, Kaylene Watson, D R Thomas Limited	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S241.009	Matthew Draper and Michaela Jannard	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S352.009	Philibert Jean-G Frick	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S497.005	Mark John Wyborn	Rules	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.	Accept in part	
S493.006	William Goodfellow	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above	Amend all provision in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.		
S494.006	Ian Jepson	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend all provision in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.	Accept in part	
S422.009	Maurice Dabbah	Rules	Support	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretionary and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S423.009	Bernard Sabrier	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through the application of specified overlays and rules.	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S345.011	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Rules	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	are in general accordance with the ResourceConsents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.	
S491.004	Eric Kloet	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part
S425.035	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Rules	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Accept in part
S222.044	Wendover Two Limited	Rules	Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried	Insert a new rule as follows: " New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000 "	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage. A similar provision is in the Operative Whangarei District Plan 2022.	Specify the activity status as controlled activity Insert the following matter of control: a. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Insert the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
S434.009	Francois Dotta	Rules	Oppose	The Proposed Plan, if approved, will directly affect members of the [Mataka Residents'] Association by imposing undue restrictions on the construction of residential dwellings on the Site through	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status, rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the application of specified overlays and rules.	consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		
S435.009	Elka Gouzer	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Accept in part	
S490.004	Owen Burn	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part	
S492.004	Ironwood Trust Limited	Rules	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings.	Delete all rules in the plan that require activities located within an identified Outstanding Natural Landscape to be assessed as non-complying activities	Accept in part	
S363.036	Foodstuffs North Island Limited	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				"activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.	
S516.084	Ngā Tai Ora - Public Health Northland	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.	Reject
S167.041	Bentzen Farm Limited	Rules	Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments,	Insert new rule as follows: "New buildings or	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000" Specify the activity status as controlled activity Insert the following matter of control:1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Insert the following clause: Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.13	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
FS383.2	The Shooting Box Limited		Support	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS384.2	P S Yates Family Trust		Support	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka	Allow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
FS566.403	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees with the primary submitter that the default to non complying activity under this rule imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners at Mataka Station, where the appropriateness of the building locations and the controls that apply to them by way of instruments on the title have already been deemed to be appropriate by the Council through the original subdivision consent. The rule fails to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme and will impose undue restrictions on residential activity that is anticipated by the consented Mataka Scheme to the detriment of members of the Association. The further submitter considers that in relation to Mataka Station residential activity and buildings should be a	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				permitted activity, rather than a controlled activity as sought by the submitter, where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
S91.016	PF Olsen Limited	Rules	Oppose	There is no justification to require plantation forestry earthworks to comply with more stringent standards for earthworks in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays, and for those standards to also not equally apply to other primary production land use. Rules in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays are already in the plan for plantation forestry activities in these overlays. Plantation forestry activities include earthworks. Earthworks are undertaken in the main to provide access and infrastructure. The proposed standards might be applicable to land recontouring activities but not earthworks for plantation forestry. The drafting provides a legal nonsense in that replanting plantation forest is a discretionary activity (under rules NFL-R5 and CE-R6) but is required for the earthworks to be permitted under this standard and rule EW-R7. The earthworks Matters of Discretion go well beyond the scope of the District Council's powers under section 31 of the Resource Management Act.	Amend the rules for plantation forestry activities in the Natural Features and Landscapes overlays limiting to only apply to plantation forestry earthworks. Delete the irrelevant Matters of Discretion for earthworks in Natural Features and Landscapes overlays.	Amend the rules to provide consistency of application for primary production activities.	Accept in part	
FS176.16	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited		Support	As set out in the original submission	Allow		Accept in part	
FS108.16	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As set out in the original submission	Allow		Accept in part	
FS566.105	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As set out in the original submission	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						with our original submission	
S179.078	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Rules	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and development of coastal lands in the area.	Retain rules		Accept in part
FS51.98	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.041	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S148.029	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Rules	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and	Amend rules to provide for existing Plantation Forestry and Plantation Forestry Activities in an ONL and/or ONF as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.			
FS108.17	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter.	Allow		Accept in part
FS346.535	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.141	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S483.160	Top Energy Limited	Rules	Not Stated	Top Energy seeks inclusion as a permitted activity for upgrades to existing electricity infrastructure that cannot comply with NFL - R1 PER (3) relating to 20% GFA and PER 4 relating to NFL-31 maximum height. Given that these network utilities are already present on the landscape, Top Energy seeks to ensure that they can be appropriately upgraded to meet the demands of technology, and ensure continued resilient, flexible and adaptable supply throughout the District. Top Energy also notes, that given the interdependencies of Top Energy's networks, some of the lower voltage lines within these rural coastal communities meet the criteria of Regionally Significant Infrastructure. Top Energy considers that the amendments sought result in better alignment with RPS policies (5.2.2 and 5.3.2 in particular).	Insert a new rule as follows (or to the same effect)): NFL-RX Upgrade of electricity network utilities Activity Status: Permitted Where: PER - 1 The upgrade of electricity network utility structures or buildings: 1. is within 5m of the existing alignment location of the original structure or building; 2. does not increase the gross floor area by more than 30 percent in a 10-year period if it is a building; 3. complies with the zones permitted setback standards if it is a building; 4. does not result in pole or tower height that exceeds 25m above ground level; 5. does not result in more than two additional poles; 6. does not result in additional towers; and 7. any additional cross arms do not		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					exceed a length of more than 4m.		
FS196.218	Joe Carr		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS346.083	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.211	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support		Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S496.005	Philip Thornton	Rules	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities be deleted.		Accept in part
FS411.005	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
S511.083	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further	Insert a new rule Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONL Activity Status: non-complying		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.			
FS164.083	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		
FS570.1654	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS566.1668	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		original submission		
FS569.1690	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
S511.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Rules	Not Stated	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert New Rule "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONF Activity Status: prohibited"		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS164.084	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject	
FS570.1655	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS566.1669	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		original submission		
FS569.1691	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
S243.059	Matauri Trustee Limited	Rules	Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of	Insert new rule as follows:New buildings or structures, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings or structures within an approved building platform or buildable area on a site for which a subdivision consent was granted after 1 January 2000 Specify the activity status as controlled activity Include the following matter of			Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.	control:1. Compliance with location, height, design and mitigation conditions which apply to the site or building platform by way of resource consent condition or consent notice. Include the following clause:Building/s which are a controlled activity under this rule shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS570.617	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.		original submission		
FS566.631	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.		inconsistent with our original submission		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.653	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	There are subdivisions in the district, including in coastal environments, where resource consents have been granted and/or titles issued specifying controls on the location and size of building platforms, and controlling these through legally binding instruments. Such forms of subdivision were encouraged under the Management Plan rule of the Operative Plan. This form of rule is proposed to be carried over into the Proposed Plan, and so may result in more such forms of subdivision. As drafted in rule NFL-R1, where these occur in the coastal areas, the activity status of dwellings defaults to non-complying, regardless of prior entitlements provided by subdivision. In many cases, the subdivisions have been carefully designed and have detailed controls imposed by way of consent condition and consent notices on the titles to manage the effects of buildings. Owners have purchased lots on the understanding that their entitlement to build on them is protected. The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on an approved building platform. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk to current owners. Controlled activity is an appropriate activity class because the Council will have already assessed appropriations in such circumstance and all that may be required will be an evaluation against the conditions of the subdivision consent/consent notices. Typically, such subdivisions have occurred in more recent times and so a cut-off date as proposed in the relief may also be appropriate. Non-notification is also appropriate as	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the substantive consideration as to whether a building is acceptable on the approved building platform will have occurred already at subdivision stage.				
S359.032	Northland Regional Council	Rules	Support in part	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Amend the rules to expand the permitted activity rule to allow for fencing within natural character areas, ONLs and ONFs where fencing is required for protection or enhancement of soil conservation treatments, water bodies and wetlands and in line with the Stock Exclusion Regulations and/or regional plan rules.		Accept in part	
FS570.1068	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS346.493	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.1082	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1104	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						original submission		
FS373.007	Lucklaw Farm Ltd		Support	There is potential for unintended consequences of the rules applying to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features as new fencing requires resource consent.	Allow	I seek that the whole of the submission point be allowed	Accept in part	
S442.102	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert new rule: "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONL Activity Status: Non-Complying"		Reject	
FS346.713	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
S442.103	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Rules	Neutral	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Insert new rule: "Extension to Mineral Extraction activity in ONF Activity Status: Prohibited"		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
FS346.714	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
S344.044	Paihia Properties Holdings Corporate Trustee Limited and UP Management Ltd	Rules	Not Stated	The submitter has identified that the overlay chapters are inconsistent with respect to referencing rules for "activities not otherwise listed". The How the Plan Works chapter includes a statement that some overlays will automatically default to a permitted activity. Noting that resource consent may still be required under other Part 2: District-wide Matters chapters and/or Part 3: Area-Specific chapters (including the underlying zone). This lack of consistency will cause confusion for plan users: 1. The overlay chapters do not include notes to this effect. 2. Each overlay chapter has a different approach activity status default rules. 3. Overlays and zone chapters use different terminology. Applying an automatic permitted activity default could lead to unintentional consequences.	Amend all relevant overlay chapters as necessary to insert rules for "Activities not otherwise listed in this chapter" consistent with zone chapters.		Reject	
FS396.065	Ed and Inge Amsler		Support	The submission seeks various changes in relation to the urban environment / coastal environment interface as well as specific provisions in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, the submission seeks better reflection of business land needs that should be reflected throughout the Plan.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
S230.009	Mataka Residents' Association Inc	Rules	Oppose	The provisions fail to provide for residential activity in accordance with the consented Mataka Scheme, do not represent the most appropriate way of exercising the Council's functions, will	Amend any other provisions including alternative activity status rules, matters for discretion and assessment criteria that give effect to this		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and are not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).	submission, or any other consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.		
FS566.568	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
S511.080	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Notes	Support in part	For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule NFL-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter There may be further significant indigenous biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with the RPS. As well there may be other vegetation that requires protection in alignment with the RPS, policy 4.4.1.	Amend notes The Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters earthworks indigenous vegetation rules , the most stringent rule will apply.		Accept
FS164.080	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).		
FS570.1651	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	
FS566.1665	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1687	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept	
S442.099	Kapiro Conservation Trust	Notes	Support	For some reason Note 3 only refers to the Earthworks chapter. When Rule NFL-R3 applies to both Earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance. This note should also relate to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter. There may be further significant indigenous biodiversity beyond the areas identified as SNA in the overlays where preservation and protection is required in accordance with the RPS. As well there may be other vegetation that requires protection in alignment with the RPS, policy 4.4.1.	Amend notes: The Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter rules apply in addition to the earthwork and indigenous vegetation clearance rules in this overlay chapter, not instead of. In the event of a conflict between the earthworks and ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapters earthworks indigenous vegetation rules , the most stringent rule will apply.			Accept
FS346.710	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept	
S421.156	Northland Federated	NFL-R1	Support in part	Federated Farmers supports the recognition in rule NFL-R1 of the	Amend PER-1 (inferred) of Rule NFL-R1 so that the		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Farmers of New Zealand			functional need for ancillary to farming structures to be in place. The workability of the 25m2 maximum area in performance standard PER-1 means that almost every ancillary farming structure / building will require a consent under discretionary which is not appropriate. The 25m2 maximum area restriction means that even a small kitset residential garage would be required to apply for a consent. For a farm building/structure this means that the rule does not provide for the necessary buildings (such as barns and machinery storage sheds) that a farmer relies upon to effectively operate within the landscape. Farmers and the Council will find themselves going through the resource consent process for everyday buildings and structures that form part of normal farming operations, and which have no more than minor impacts on the values of outstanding natural landscapes and features.	maximum area of structures is 250m² instead of 25m²		
FS24.18	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.166	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part
FS285.12	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow		Accept in part
FS165.5	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.				
FS272.6	Nicole Way and Christopher Hultjich		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.	Allow in part			Accept in part
FS570.1388	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission		Accept in part
FS346.390	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 in part
FS566.1402	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission		Accept in part
FS569.1424	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity 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 to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission		Accept in part
FS369.388	Top Energy		Support in part	Agree with submitter. Additionally, a 25m2 farm building likely won't require	Allow in part	Amend		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				a building consent, so the FNDC would find this requirement impossible to enforce and monitor in any event.			
S167.040	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per-se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. The rule fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration.	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows:	Accept in part	
					Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: ~~4. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 1. no greater than 25 50m². PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: ~~4. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 12. no greater than 25 50m². PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Insert the following rule: PER-5 Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Insert a matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					characteristics and qualities. l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert new clause as follows: Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.26	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS393.012	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme	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
				and located on the consented House Site location.				
FS401.009	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS305.067	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	
FS566.402	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Disallow		Accept in part	
FS369.381	Top Energy		Support in part	The rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a permitted activity in the case of Matata, to enable residential activity and buildings as a permitted activity where they are in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.				
S493.004	William Goodfellow	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.		Accept in part	
FS67.113	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	
FS68.111	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept in part	
FS369.393	Top Energy		Support in part	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.			
S159.061	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R1	Oppose	The policy only provides for buildings and structures in very limited circumstances. Given the extent of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes in the Far North this is very limiting.	Amend subsection 2 of PER-1 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: (2) no greater than 25m ² 100m ²	Accept in part	
FS151.225	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS151.226	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS393.009	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support		Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS534.040	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support		Allow	Amend subsection 2 of PER- 1 of Rule NFL-R1	Accept in part
FS346.0010	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.223	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.237	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.259	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S483.158	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	No provision has been made to allow for new network utilities of an appropriate scale within these environments. Top Energy generally supports a preference to underground infrastructure where possible in ONL and ONFs, but this needs to be enabled and may require additional network utility buildings and structures (e.g., transformers and pillars) above ground to facilitate this which would otherwise comply with the 25m² and 5m height limit afforded to buildings and structures ancillary to farming. On review of the s32 analysis for the Coastal Environment, it is understood that structures associated with primary production are enabled; this analysis does not expressly identify why. However, it is assumed it is because farming activities are a common fixture within this environment and that farming is a dominant primary sector industry within the District as is highlighted in the s32 Overview). Given that connection to electricity	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as a follows (or to the same effect)): ."PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside or inside the coastal environment it is: 1.ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit) or a network utility ; 2.no greater than 25m ² .PER-2If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);2. no greater than 25m ² .		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				infrastructure is critical to such operations, Top Energy seeks that the same permitted activity threshold applies to network utilities. Further Top Energy notes that PER-2 thresholds duplicate that in PER-1.				
FS196.217	Joe Carr		Support	provides for an essential service	Allow		Accept in part	
FS111.084	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	provides for an essential service	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part	
FS345.209	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	provides for an essential service	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part	
S495.003	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity.	Delete Rule NFL-R1 (inferred).		Accept in part	
FS78.021	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The proposed Rule does not provide for infrastructure such as the National Grid to be located within these areas where there is a functional or operational need to locate such infrastructure there and there is no other practicable location. This does not appropriately give effect to policies 2, 3, 4 and 8 of the NPSET.	Allow	Accept in part	Accept in part	
FS410.003	Craig Heatley		Support	The proposed Rule does not provide for infrastructure such as the National Grid to be located within these areas where there is a functional or operational need	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
				to locate such infrastructure there and there is no other practicable location. This does not appropriately give effect to policies 2, 3, 4 and 8 of the NPSET.				
S495.006	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1		Accept in part	
FS78.022	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Support	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.	Allow	Allow the original submission (inferred).	Accept in part	
FS410.006	Craig Heatley		Support	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS369.395	Top Energy		Support in part	The submitter considers that non-complying activity status for infrastructure such as the National Grid located in an ONL or ONF is too onerous.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	
S454.093	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	NFL-R1	Not Stated	There is no difference between the requirements of PER-1 and PER-2 and the rule does not allow for the provision of new infrastructure. Due to its linear nature and the requirement to connect new electricity generation to the National Grid, regardless of where the new generation facilities are located, transmission lines may need to traverse any area within the Far North District. While Transpower is required to seek to avoid locating transmission facilities within	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); and 2. no greater than 25m2. The new building or structure is for infrastructure. PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				sensitive areas, there may be occasions when sensitive areas cannot be avoided and, in these cases, critical infrastructure needs to be provided for.	environment it is:3. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);4. no greater than 25m2.		
FS111.083	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part
FS346.038	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS404.027	Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation		Oppose	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.389	Top Energy		Support in part	PHTTCCT support that provisions should be made for new infrastructure within this rule.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S496.003	Philip Thornton	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.		Accept in part
FS411.003	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Accept in part
FS369.401	Top Energy		Support in part	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.			
S46.002	David King	NFL-R1	Oppose	The submitter considers that NFL-R1/Per-2, as it applies to new buildings or structures within a coastal environment, is too prohibitive. The submitter considers that it should be a person's right to build a residential unit along with any required ancillary structure on land to which they have guaranteed title to and that the Local Authority (FNDC) sees fit to levy payable rates on that land. And, that any required earthworks to achieve that activity should also be included as being permitted.	Amend NFL-R1/Per-2 to include residential units within a coastal environment and to also permit earthworks related to that activity.	Accept in part	
FS393.002	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS401.002	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS369.380	Top Energy		Support in part	For the reasons given within the Original Submission No 046.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S168.043	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 1.2. no greater than 25 50m² . PER-2 If a new building or structure is	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m², rather than 25m², better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input	located within the coastal environment it is:1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 12.-no greater than 25 50m². PER-3 ... PER-4 ... Insert the following rule: PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Insert a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development;c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity;d. the ability of the environment to absorb change;e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert a new clause as follows:Building/s which do not comply with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 or PER-4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.068	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.382	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	
S187.035	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: the building per-se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled; the failure to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits.; inclusion of limitation of dwellings as per drafting proposed at PER-5; the rules ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms; 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds; non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity; and except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration.	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit)~~ 1. 2. no greater than ~~25~~ 50m2 . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit)~~ 1 2. no greater than 25 50m2 . PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Add the following rule: PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non			Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Add a matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development c. any means of Integrating the building, structure or activity d. the ability of the environment to absorb change e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature. j. the natural landform and processes of the location; and k. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities;	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.		
FS305.069	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS369.383	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S222.043	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles,	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is:1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 2. no greater than 25-50m ² . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 2. no greater than 25 50m ² . PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials PER-5 Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary / non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Insert matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; c. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; d. the ability of the environment to absorb change; e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					activity or development outside the landscape or feature;h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;j. the natural landform and processes of the location; andk. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.m. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.Insert a new clause as follows: Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.070	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS369.384	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S243.058	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that	Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows:		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles, including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m², rather than 25m², better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values	Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 1. 2. no greater than 25 50m². PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is:1. ~~ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit);~~ 1 2. no greater than25 50m². PER-3 Any extension to a lawfully established building or structure is no greater than 20% of the GFA of the existing lawfully established building or structure. PER-4 The building or structure, or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies with standards: NFL-S1 Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Add the following rule:PER-5Where the new building is for a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL and ONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a new activity status where compliance is not	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input	achieved with rule PER-5 as a non-complying activity. Add matters of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; c. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; d. the ability of the environment to absorb change; e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; j. the natural landform and processes of the location; - and k. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. l. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. m. Whether the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					location is on a previously approved building platform. Add new clause as follows: Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS305.071	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS570.616	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.630	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.652	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						with our original submission		
FS369.385	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part	
S333.035	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R1	Oppose	The building per -se, rather than the use of the building, is the matter that should be controlled in this instance, having regard to the purpose of the rule. As such the requirement for the building to be ancillary to farming should be deleted. Reliance is still able to be placed on the other controls and standards referred to in the rule to manage effects on natural features and landscapes. Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay, in accordance with the underlying zone. They otherwise default to non-complying in the coastal environment as this rule is drafted in the Proposed Plan. This fails to recognise the existence of residential units in ONLs and the benefits that subdivision, use and development associated with residential units can bring to ONFs and ONLs. Should the concern be the proliferation of residential dwellings in the coastal environment, then this can be managed by the inclusion of a rule limiting as a per the drafting proposed at PER-5. As drafted, the rule ignores that there are titles,	<i>Amend Rule NFL-R1 as follows:Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 If a new building orstructure is located outside the coastal environment it is:1. ancillary to farming(excluding a residential unit); 1. 2. no greater than 2550m² . PER-2 If a new building orstructure is located within the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming(excluding a residential unit); 1 2. no greater than 2550m2. PER-3 Any extension to a lawfullyestablished building or structure is no greater than20% of the GFA of the existing lawfullyestablished building or structure.PER-4 The building or structure,or extension or alteration to an existing building or structure, complies withstandards: NFL-S1Maximum height NFL-S2 Colours and materials Insert the following rule: PER-5</i> Where the new building isfor a residential unit, there is only one residential unit within the ONL andONF area on the lot. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achievedwith rules PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and PER-4 from discretionary /non complying torestricted discretionary in the case of			Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				including titles with approved building platforms, which have occurred through a subdivision process which has confirmed the suitability of a residential unit, but are as yet unbuilt on. That should be recognised as a matter of discretion, or in the preferred alternative added as a controlled activity as also sought by this submission. 50m2, rather than 25m2, better provides for small farm sheds that are typical in rural environments. Non-conformity with the rule is more effectively and efficiently dealt with as a restricted discretionary activity. This is because the matters of discretion are capable of being confined to effects on the identified characteristics and values of the feature. Except for more than one dwelling per lot, notification should not be a consideration, as the restricted discretionary matters are limited in their scope and need not involve third party input.	each rule. Insert a new activity status where compliance is not achieved with rule PER-5 as anon-complying activity. Insert matters of discretion as follows: 1. <i>The effects on the identified characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the location, scale and design of any proposed development; c. any means of integrating the building, structure or activity; d. the ability of the environment to absorb change; e. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; f. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; g. Except as provided for under m and n below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; h. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; i. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; j. the natural landform and processes of the location; and k. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.</i> 1. <i>Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.</i> m. Whether the location is on a previously approved	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					building platform. Insert new clause as follows: <i>Building/s which do not comply with PER1, PER2, PER3 or PER4 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).</i>		
FS305.072	Dempsey Family Trust		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow	Allow the original submission subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part
FS369.387	Top Energy		Support in part	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
FS369.406	Top Energy		Oppose	Residential Units should be provided for in the overlay.	Disallow		Accept in part
S67.007	Michael John Winch	NFL-R1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part
FS346.830	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.056	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.563	Top Energy		Support in part	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S277.016	Alec Jack	NFL-R1	Oppose	Approximately 270ha of our farm falls into the Outstanding Natural Feature overlay. I support the permission to establish new buildings ancillary to farming but oppose the exclusion of residential unit and the restriction to 25m2. As we transition from ruminant farming to intensive horticulture we will need more buildings and dwellings - to reduce carbon emissions and prosper.	Amend rule NFL-R1 as following: 'PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming (excluding a residential unit); 2. no greater than 25m2.		Accept in part
FS369.386	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S490.003	Owen Burn	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Orokawa Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes		Reject
FS369.390	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject
S491.003	Eric Kloet	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include imitations on the height, colour and reflectivity of buildings.	and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes			
FS369.391	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	
S492.003	Ironwood Trust Limited	NFL-R1	Oppose	The standards proposed for activities within the overlays applying to the site at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Further, the submitter considers that the activity status imposed on activities within the coastal environment are unnecessarily onerous. These include the identification of farming and forestry as discretionary activities, setbacks from MHWS and imitations on the height and colour of buildings.	Delete the provisions of Rule NFL-R1 relating to height, area and colours/reflectivity for new buildings in Outstanding Natural Landscapes		Reject	
FS369.392	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Reject	
FS369.396	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S494.004	Ian Jepson	NFL-R1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.	Accept in part	
FS369.394	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part	Amend	Accept in part
S497.013	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-R1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the area of new buildings in ONLs.	Accept in part	
FS369.402	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part		R Accept in part
S502.038	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R1	Support in part	It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m2 and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m2 within sites containing an outstanding landscape overlay, will meet the objectives and policies of the overlay by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater than 25m2. The reasoning behind this is that	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming and no greater than 25m² (excluding a residential unit); or 2. a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m ² . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				there are areas which are within ONF or ONL which are not used for farming activities, such a small gardening/storage sheds. Therefore, provision is required for non-habitable buildings not associated with farming activities. Once again, the height, colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 25m ² or less is not considered to adversely affect the characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF.	environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming and no greater than 25m² (excluding a residential unit); or 2. a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m ² . In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.		
FS369.403	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S503.020	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R1	Not Stated	It is considered that provision should be made for buildings no greater than 25m ² and not ancillary to farming, such as sheds/garages. PER-4 provides additional controls on height and colours and materials, which are to be complied with. With these controls in place, it is considered that buildings no greater than 25m ² within sites with an outstanding landscape overlay, will meet the objectives and policies of the overlay by ensuring the characteristics and qualities of the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved. Provision has also been made for buildings or structures ancillary to farming activities, no greater than 25m ² . The reasoning behind this is that the area which is subject to the Outstanding Landscape overlay within the Waitangi Treaty Grounds is not used for farming activities. Therefore, provision is required for non-habitable buildings not associated with farming activities. Once	Amend PER-1 and PER-2 of Rule NFL-R1 as follows: PER-1 If a new building or structure is located outside the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming and no greater than 25m² (excluding a residential unit); or 2. a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m ² . PER-2 If a new building or structure is located within the coastal environment it is: 1. ancillary to farming and no greater than		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				again, the height and colours and materials of such buildings are controlled by PER-4, such that any building of 25m ² or less is not considered to adversely affect the characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF.	25m ² (excluding a residential unit); or 2. a non-habitable building not ancillary to farming no greater than 25m ² . In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.		
FS369.404	Top Energy		Support in part	Top Energy seeks to amend this rule to provide for underground infrastructure and additional network utility buildings and structures.	Allow in part		Accept in part
S333.036	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.	Delete Rule NFL-R2		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S168.044	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	
S187.036	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay.	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	
S222.045	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	There is no need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should be otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources	Delete Rule NFL-R2	Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes. An example is existing houses in the ONF and ONL, whereby their repair and maintenance (including any normal domestic maintenance) would trigger a full discretionary activity resource consent because they are not specified in the repair or maintenance rule.			
S421.157	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R2	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks that additional activities be included under the permitted threshold in rule NFL-R2. There are activities that are important for the continued viability and operational level for both landowners and emergency services to carry out their duties. These activities may include works that are located within an outstanding natural landscape and/or feature. Examples of such activities included (but are not limited to) activities ancillary to farming activities, emergency related activities for fire, flooding etc and biosecurity related works. Providing for emergency works is necessary to ensure that landowners undertaking necessary work to manage a sudden emergency event can be done without breaching district plan rules. Biosecurity related works are also relevant to ensure clearance can be done due to the increased risk of biosecurity breaches being spread around to flora and fauna.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NFL-R2 to include additional activities, being farming activities, emergency services work, and biosecurity works	Accept in part	
FS24.19	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part
FS143.60	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS196.165	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS285.13	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS165.6	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS272.7	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich		Support in part	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS570.1389	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS346.391	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.1403	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1425	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.407	Top Energy		Oppose	Agree with the sentiment expressed.	Disallow		Accept in part	
S167.042	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	Repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule NFL-R2		Accept	
FS143.14	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Allow		Accept	
FS393.013	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	
FS401.0010	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	
FS566.404	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The further submitter agrees that repairs and maintenance should be permitted under the respective rules	Disallow		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay to avoid unnecessary consenting obligations and provide for normal land management practices.			
S503.021	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R2	Not Stated	We are unsure whether it is the intent of the plan to cover just historic features or whether this rule seeks to extend wider to other elements which may not be historic. Regardless of this fact we seek that the following features also be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within the coastal environment and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like. The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. The Operative Plan provided for renovation and maintenance of buildings as a permitted activity, with no requirement for scale, size and materials being like for like. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal is preserved and enhanced.	Amend Rule NFL-R2 to insert four new matters as follows: Carparking areas Board walks Boat ramps Buildings or structures In the event the wider reaching relief if not accepted, we seek that the above relief be applied to the Waitangi Estate only.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS51.37	Heritage New Zealand Pouterie Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a heritage focused planning framework over Waitangi, specifically, the extent of Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds as identified through the National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu. Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The planning framework sought by HNZPT is to correctly reflect and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision is to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree of certainty for the management of facilities located at the Treaty Grounds.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS369.564	Top Energy		Oppose	HNZPT's primary submission (409) seeks a heritage focused planning framework over Waitangi, specifically, the extent of Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds as identified through the National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna Kōrero Tūturu. Te Pitowhenua/Waitangi Treaty Grounds is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The planning framework sought by HNZPT is to correctly reflect and protects the heritage significance of the place. However, if the decision is to retain the Rural Production zone over the Grounds the addition of this proposed text would provide a degree	Disallow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of certainty for the management of facilities located at the Treaty Grounds.				
S243.060	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R2	Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Delete Rule NFL-R2		Accept	
FS570.618	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS566.632	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.		is inconsistent with our original submission		
FS569.654	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	There need not be a rule for an activity class of repair and maintenance. Repairs and maintenance should otherwise be permitted under the respective rules relating to the buildings, earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance activity classes within the overlay. Those rules (as sought to be amended by this submission) most effectively and efficiently manage the effects of relevant activities on the resources managed by the overlay. Unforeseen consequences will result with the rule as drafted where classes of repairs and maintenance not listed will fall to discretionary activity, triggering costly and unnecessary consent processes.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
S160.022	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-R2	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule NFL-R2 PER-1 as it is considered that the inclusion of farming tracks but the exclusion of plantation forestry tracks is not fair or equitable.	Amend rule to include production forestry tracks.		Accept in part	
FS346.592	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's functions and responsibilities under section 31(1)(b)(iii) and Section 6 the	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				RMA and do not give effect to the RPS, NPSFM, NPSIB and the NZCPS. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.			
S67.030	Michael John Winch	NFL-R2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part
FS346.853	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.079	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S483.159	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R2	Support	Top Energy supports the repair or maintenance of network utilities as a permitted activity	Retain Rule NFL-R2		Accept in part
FS345.210	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	NGL is a subsidiary of Top Energy Limited. NGL supports all submission points made by Top Energy.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S277.017	Alec Jack	NFL-R2	Support	I support the ability to repair & maintain as per the listed activities in PER-1. Repairs and maintenance are an essential component of sustainable business and land use.	Retain NFL-R2 PER-1.		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS369.405	Top Energy		Support	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Allow		Accept in part
S502.039	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R2	Support in part	We seek that additional features be added as they are similar in nature to others described within the list. These features are common within areas of ONF and ONL and require ongoing repair and maintenance to ensure there are no adverse impacts on the surrounding environment and that they remain in good condition. It is considered unnecessary for additional consent to be required for repair and maintenance of such features, if the size, scale and materials used are like for like. The same is considered to apply for buildings and structures. It is considered that with the additional control of requiring scale, size and materials to be like for like, this will ensure that any repair and maintenance on buildings and/or structures does not change how the natural character of the coastal environment is perceived. Once again, repair and maintenance of lawfully established buildings and structures is required on an on-going basis to ensure that the natural character of the coastal environment is preserved and enhanced.	Amend Rule NFL-R2 to insert four new matters as follows: Carparking areas Board walks Boat ramps Buildings or structures		Accept in part
FS369.408	Top Energy		Oppose	Top Energy seeks to retain this rule as notified.	Disallow		Accept in part
S277.018	Alec Jack	NFL-R3	Support	I support the ability to undertake earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Retain NFL-R3.		Accept in part
S333.037	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-R3	Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: <i>Activity status:</i> <i>Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1. required for the repair or maintenance</i>		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads.	<i>permitted under NFL-R2</i> Repair or maintenance. 1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like: 1. roads. 2. fences 3. network utilities 4. driveways and access 5. walking tracks 6. cycling tracks 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3 Except as permitted under PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary / non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a matter of discretion as follows: 1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the ability of the environment to absorb change; c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; d. the operational or functional need	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; i. the natural landform and processes of the location; and j. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert new clause as follows: Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S168.045	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where:	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				earthworks associated with these. Repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for	PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:4. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. ... 3. 4.... 5. ... 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development on previously approved building platforms. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2Except as permitted under PER-1, ¶the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3Except as permitted under PER-1 ¶the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is notachieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert a new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S187.037	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks given PER-1; repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself; more exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for; the need for earthworks exemptions is heightened with the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019; non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity - Policy NFL-P8 provides the necessary matters of assessment; importance of providing development on previously approved building platforms; and a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:1. ~~required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.~~ 1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance. Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, Per-2 and PER-3 from discretionary / non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects b. the ability of the environment to absorb change c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation cleared d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6 g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature i. the natural landform and processes of the location j. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Add new clause as follows: Earthworks or indigenous vegetation	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S222.046	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R3	Support	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:1. required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2Except as permitted under PER-1, Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment ~~is not provided for within NFL-R3-PER-1~~ but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3Except as permitted under PER-1 Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment ~~is not provided for within NFL-R3-PER-1~~ but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary /non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert the matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.k. Whether locating	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.I. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform.Insert a new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).	
S222.047	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature; While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not	Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characterises of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, the then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.			
S421.158	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R3	Support in part	Federated Farmers seeks that additional activities be included under the permitted threshold in rule NFL-R3. There are activities that are important for the continued viability and operational level for both landowners and emergency services to carry out their duties. These activities may include works that are located within an outstanding natural landscape and/or feature. Examples of such activities included (but are not limited to) activities ancillary to farming activities, emergency related activities for fire, flooding etc and works required for access.	Amend PER-1 of Rule NFL-R3 to include additional activities, being farming activities, emergency services works, and works required for access		Accept in part
FS24.20	Lynley Newport		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part
FS143.61	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part
FS196.164	Joe Carr		Support	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow		Accept in part
FS285.14	Alistair and Cheryl Baxter		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS165.7	Paradise Found Developments Limited		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS272.8	Nicole Way and Christopher Huijich		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow in part		Accept in part	
FS534.041	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Allow	Amend PER-1 of Rule NFLR3	Accept in part	
FS570.1390	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS346.392	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.1404	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1426	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Agree with sentiment expressed.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
S167.043	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (ie lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. The need for exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of "earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is:1- required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like:1. roads.2. fences3. network utilities4. driveways and access5. walking tracks6. cycling tracks7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling.7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens.8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					height) or operate a plantation forestry activity.10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway.11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation.12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2Except as permitted under PER-1, Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3Except as permitted under PER-1 Tthe earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary /non complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Insert a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					established the landscape or feature, having regard to: a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects; b. the ability of the environment to absorb change; c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance; d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location; e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature; f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6; g. the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature; h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature; i. the natural landform and processes of the location; - and j. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities. k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Insert new clause as follows: Earthworks or indigenous vegetation	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS143.15	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The applicant agrees that further exceptions to the rule should be made for normal farming and rural practices. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the definition referred to in the rule already. The further submitter also considers that in relation to Mataka Station, earthworks and vegetation clearance should be a permitted activity where they enable residential activity and buildings in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS566.405	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The applicant agrees that further exceptions to the rule should be made for normal farming and rural practices. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by the definition referred to in the rule already. The further submitter also considers that in relation to Mataka Station, earthworks and vegetation clearance should be a permitted activity where they enable residential activity and buildings in accordance with the Mataka Scheme and located on the consented House Site location.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S167.044	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	This rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the	Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative,		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming.	Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.		
FS143.16	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may be required for every new future aspect of the operation.	Allow		Accept in part
FS401.011	Carrington Estate Jade LP and Carrington Farms Jade LP		Support	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may be required for every new future aspect of the operation.	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
FS566.406	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As noted by the submitter, while existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms, as is the case at Mataka Station. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on the existing farming operation where resource consents may be required for every new future aspect of the operation.	Disallow		Accept in part	
S159.062	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R3	Support	Clearance for biosecurity purposes is supported.	Retain subsection 4 of PER-1 of Rule NFL-R3		Accept	
FS151.227	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept	
FS570.224	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS566.238	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS569.260	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						inconsistent with our original submission	
S495.012	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R3	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to PER-3 of Rule NFL-R3		Accept in part
FS410.012	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part
S511.081	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NFL-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL -R3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part
FS164.081	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).		
FS548.164	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought	Accept in part	
FS570.1652	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.				
FS566.1666	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1688	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				being recognised as a high character area.			
S483.161	Top Energy Limited	NFL-R3	Not Stated	Top Energy supports NFL-R3 in particular PER- 1 (2) but seeks that this be extended to provide for upgrading as provided for in the new rule sought. Further, Top Energy suggests that PER-3 is deleted and PER-2 relied on for both inside and outside of the coastal environment noting that in both instances NFL-S3 is referenced.	Insert new point and amend PER 1 of Rule NFL-R3, amend PER-2 of Rule NFL-R3, and delete PER-3 of Rule NFL-R3 as follows (or to the same effect): Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1.required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.: or 2.required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for existing overhead power lines.: or 3.necessary to address a risk to public health and safety.: or 4.for biosecurity reasons.: or 5.for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori.: or 6.Required for the upgrade of network utilities where the works are permitted under NF-RX PER-2 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is inside or outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance ~~PER-3The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3~~	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance to provide for earthworks and vegetation clearance associated with upgrading of infrastructure.		
FS346.084	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are not standards associated with that rule.	Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS345.212	Ngawha Generation Limited		Support	Upgrading is not appropriate as a permitted activity, particularly where there are not standards associated with that rule.	Allow	Allow all of the relief sought by Top Energy Limited in its submission (S483).	Accept in part
S243.061	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for	Amend Rule NFL-R3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance is: 1. ~~required for the repair or maintenance permitted under NFL-R2 Repair or maintenance.~~ 1. Required for the repair or maintenance of the following activities where they have been lawfully established and where the size, scale and materials used are like for like: 1. roads 2. fences 3. network utilities 4. driveways and access 5. walking tracks 6. cycling tracks 7. farming tracks. 2. required to provide for safe and reasonable clearance for		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL- P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.	existing overhead power lines. 3. necessary to address a risk to public health and safety. 4. for biosecurity reasons. 5. for the sustainable non-commercial harvest of plant material for rongoā Māori. 6. for vegetation clearance required to establish or maintain a firebreak within 20m of a dwelling. 7. for cultivation (for earthworks only) or domestic gardens. 8. for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. 9. required to maintain an operational farm (including the maintenance or reinstatement of pasture where the vegetation to be cleared is less than 15 years old and less than 6m in height) or operate a plantation forestry activity. 10. required for vegetation clearance to maintain an existing driveway to a dwelling, within 5m of that driveway. 11. required for vegetation clearance as a strip of no more than 3.5m wide to construct new fences for the purpose of stock control or boundary delineation. 12. required for vegetation clearance within the legal width of an existing formed road. PER-2 Except as permitted under PER-1, the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance outside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3 PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance PER-3 Except as permitted under PER-1 the earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance inside the coastal environment is not provided for within NFL-R3-PER-1 but it complies with standard NFL-S3 Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance Amend the activity status where compliance is not achieved with rules PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3 from discretionary/non-complying to restricted discretionary in the case of each rule. Add a matter of discretion as follows:1. The effects on the identified characteristics and qualities values that established the landscape or feature, having regard to:a. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;b. the ability of the environment to absorb change;c. the need for and location of earthworks or vegetation clearance;d. the operational or functional need of any regionally significant infrastructure to be sited in the particular location;e. Except as provided for under k and l below, any viable alternative locations for the activity or development outside the landscape or feature;f. any historical, spiritual or cultural association held by tangata whenua, with regard to the matters set out in Policy TW-P6;g. the	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature;h. the physical and visual integrity of the landscape or feature;i. the natural landform and processes of the location; andj. any positive contribution the development has on the characteristics and qualities.k. Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot.l. Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. Add new clause as follows:Earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance which do not comply with PER1, PER2 or PER3 shall be assessed without public or limited notification under sections 95A and 95B of the Resource Management Act unless special circumstances exist or notification is required under section 95B(2) and (3).		
FS570.619	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission.				

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.				
FS566.633	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for: - Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.				
FS569.655	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Given the nature of the PER-1 repair and maintenance activities (i.e. lawfully established and like for like works), there should be no limit in the volume of earthworks associated with these. For the reasons set out above in this submission, the repair and maintenance activities are better placed as a permitted activity clause within this rule itself, rather than a separate activity class. More exceptions for normal farming and rural practices should be provided for. In this regard, farming activities are often a feature of the overlay area and not providing for such activities would impose significant consent cost and risks on land owners. Where ONLs and ONFs are not farmed, then the vegetation controls provide protection. In particular, exceptions are required for:	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				- Maintenance of fire breaks (for ecosystem protection and providing for the health and safety of people) - Cultivation and domestic gardens (continuation of domestic and rural activities). - Ecosystem protection and enhancement (where vegetation may need to be thinned to release new plantings) - Maintenance of driveways and roads. The need for such exemptions is heightened by the very broad definition of earthworks" under the National Planning Standard 2019 that has been adopted in the plan. Almost all ground disturbance is captured by this definition. In each instance non-conformity should be a restricted discretionary activity. The scope of assessment is limited and the potential effects well- understood and able to be categorised as assessment matters. The policy NFL-P8, provides the necessary matters of assessment and are sought to be repeated in the rule, with the addition of new matters: - Whether locating the activity within the ONF or ONL area is required to enable reasonable residential or farming use of the lot. - Whether the location is on a previously approved building platform. The importance of providing for development on previously approved building platforms is discussed earlier in this submission. As essentially a technical assessment against a defined set of matters, a non-notification rule is appropriate as it will avoid unnecessary consent cost and risk burden on landowners.			
S243.062	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-R3	Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary	Delete rule NFL-R3 (assuming reliance can then be placed on the activity status for farming in	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	the underlying zoning as per "Applications Subject to Multiple Provisions" section of the Proposed Plan) Or, in the alternative, Amend rule NFL-R3 so that Farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.			
FS570.620	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.		submission is inconsistent with our original submission	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.634	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.656	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Under this rule, farming becomes a non-complying activity in the coastal environment and discretionary elsewhere. This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature. While existing farms may be protected by existing use rights, new farming methods or practices may not be, and may trigger the need for a resource consent with the rule as proposed. This ignores that in large sections of the district, ONF and ONLs apply over working farms. Furthermore, the values sought to be protected in these overlays often refer to pastoral and open characteristics of landscapes. The rule will impose significant compliance costs on existing farms where resource consents may be required for every new aspect of their operation. The rule as proposed is not effective nor efficient as the effects on the values and characteristics of the overlays are better managed through controls on earthworks, vegetation clearance and buildings, rather than the activity of farming. As per the overview explanation of overlays in the Proposed Plan, where there is no specific rule relevant to the activity, then it reverts to its underlying zoning (for example, if Rural Production then farming is a permitted activity). If this is the case, then the rule can and should be deleted for the reasons above. If that is not the case, then an alternative relief is sought that farming is a permitted activity in the overlay.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S442.100	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-R3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL -R3 in first instance. Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.	Accept in part	
FS346.711	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
S67.031	Michael John Winch	NFL-R3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules	Accept in part	
FS346.854	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.080	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S67.032	Michael John Winch	NFL-R4	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules	Accept in part	
FS346.855	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought	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
				would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.				
FS566.081	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S277.019	Alec Jack	NFL-R5	Oppose	I oppose the discretionary rule applying to plantation forestry and associated activities because our ruminant agriculture is under climate change pressures to switch land use into carbon sequestration and this rule will add complexity and expense to this desired land use change. There is no justification for an unlimited discretionary activity consent status to be required in this specialised context, far exceeding the objective as set out in NFL-O2.	Amend Rule NFL-R5 to remove discretionary activity status. To the extent that any resource consents are required in this context, the consent status should be restricted discretionary, with discretion restricted to effects only on natural features and landscape values.		Accept in part	
S148.028	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	NFL-R5	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF.	Delete NFL-R5		Accept in part	
FS85.24	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners.	Allow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.				
FS346.534	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.140	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports SFNZL submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule how it is written does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S160.023	Manulife Forest Management (NZ) Ltd	NFL-R5	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule NFL-R5 Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activity and considers that a discretionary activity status is onerous and does not allow for this activity on rural production land in an ONL and ONF to be established.	Delete rule NFL-R5 Plantation forestry and plantation forestry activity.		Accept in part	
FS85.25	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports Manulife submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-	Allow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.				
FS346.593	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports Manulife submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
S495.013	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R5	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R5		Accept in part	
FS85.26	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS410.013	Craig Heatley		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule,	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
				how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.				
FS393.029	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	PF Olsen supports this submission as Rule NFL-R5 does not consider the existence of plantation forests and the associated plantation forest activities within an ONL or ONF area. Plantation forestry is a long-term land use and should be treated as a right. The rule, how it is written, does not provide this to the landowners. Further, there is no provision for non-complying activity under the Natural and Built Environment Bill.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	
S67.033	Michael John Winch	NFL-R5	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	
FS346.856	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.082	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S91.011	PF Olsen Limited	NFL-R5	Oppose	There is no provision for non-complying activities under the Natural and Built Environments Bill. Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists	Delete Rule NFL-R5; and Insert permitted activity status to existing plantation forests and associated plantation forest activities.		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				within an Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted. Plantation forestry is a long term land use, with considerable financial inputs decades before any financial benefits are realised. To remove certainty of harvest and the ability to undertake other plantation forest activities does not give effect to the objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan, including Objectives NFL-02, RPROZ-O1, RPROZ-O3, RPROZ-O4 and policies RPROZ-P1. Limited earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance are provided for other primary production industries but there is no provision for any plantation forestry activities. This is unjustified and inequitable. No justification has been provided for the inclusion of more stringent rules for plantation forestry. Just because regulation 6 of the NES-PF enables this, that in itself is not justification. Regulation 12 of the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forests already requires afforestation within an outstanding natural feature or landscape to obtain consent as a restricted discretionary activity.			
FS566.100	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 in part
S277.020	Alec Jack	NFL-R6	Oppose	I oppose the discretionary status applied to farming in this area - this is	Delete rule NFL-R6 and make farming a permitted activity.		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				farmland and it is farming that has been the guardian of this ONF. Without farming it wouldn't be the fascinating landform that it is. I oppose this restrictive rule also because it impacts 270ha of our land and would cause unreasonable regulatory complexity and cost to our family business. Good fences and water systems ensure livestock can be managed without causing the accelerated erosion associated with treading damage from livestock walking between grass and water. Good farm management will preserve and enhance the area.			
S421.159	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	NFL-R6	Oppose	Federated Farmers does not support the rule and the activity classification that it has. It is illogical for the Council to require farmers to gain a resource consent if they are farming within an outstanding natural landscape or feature that is located outside of the coastal environment. Many farmers have existing operations which have occurred over decades with no more than minor effects on the surrounding environment. For many landowners the resource consent process will be too costly to make their operation economically viable. The rule as proposed is inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991. It is inappropriate as many outstanding natural landscapes and features are located in rural areas where the rural landscape adds to their value. Farming operations assist in the maintenance and protection of outstanding natural landscapes and features. It is felt that the Council is overreaching its functions under the Act through stating farming is inappropriate land use within the defined areas. It is not appropriate to try and retrofit a consenting framework through a	Delete Rule NFL-R6	Accept	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proposed district plan for an activity which has been operating legally within the specified environments. Federated Farmers does not support the proposed requirement that farming as an activity will require resource consent moving forward. We also do not support relying on existing use rights as this does not provide any clarity for landowners and Council. A reliance on existing use rights typically results in expensive discussions to establish what is included under an existing use right if one exists. Federated Farmers holds the view that existing use rights are for the same scale and character which is very hard to define for farming activities.			
FS24.21	Lynley Newport		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept
FS143.57	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept
FS143.62	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept
FS196.163	Joe Carr		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS66.108	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Allow		Accept	
FS570.1391	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS346.393	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Reject	
FS566.1405	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS569.1427	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Whilst acknowledging this only applies to new farming activities, it does not seem reasonable to require discretionary activity consent for new activities in an NFL that isn't in the coastal area.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Reject	
S159.063	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-R6	Oppose	There should be provision for rural production activities as a permitted	Amend Rule NFL-R6, also including a permitted activity threshold as follows:		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity. Rule NFL-R6 should give effect to NFL-P4.	NFL-R6 Farming Rural Production PER-1 The activity is existing lawfully established rural production activity Insert - Activity status where compliance not achieved with PER-1 - Restricted discretionary Delete DIS-1 The farming activity and is located outside the coastal environment. Delete non-complying status relating to DIS-1.		
FS151.228	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Accept in part
FS346.011	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose		Disallow	disallow the original submission	Accept in part
FS570.225	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.239	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.261	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
						is inconsistent with our original submission	
S198.002	Thomson Survey Ltd	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter opposes NFL-R6 and contends that making any kind of farming within an ONL or ONF a discretionary activity is unjustified, unacceptable and unreasonable.	Delete NRL-R6 or alternatively Amend NRL-R6 activity status to restricted discretionary and the matters of discretion should be related to the matters listed in NFL-P4		Accept in part
FS66.106	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept in part
FS66.107	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept in part
FS332.221	Russell Protection Society		Oppose	This does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Disallow in part	Disallow the original submission in part.	Accept in part
S502.040	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-R6	Oppose	Changes are sought to remove the restriction on farming activities within an area of ONL and ONF. Under this rule, if the location is within an ONL or ONF and is located within the coastal environment, then any farming activity will be a non-complying activity. This contradicts Policy NFL-P4 which stipulates that farming activities can be provided for within ONL and ONF where	Delete NFL-R6 (inferred)		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				there is no compromise to any identified characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF. It is considered that farming activities should be a permitted activity within and outside of the coastal environment.			
FS66.109	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept
S503.022	Waitangi Limited	NFL-R6	Not Stated	Changes are sought to remove the restriction on farming activities with an area of ONL and ONF. Under this rule, if the location is within an ONL or ONF and is located within the coastal environment, then any farming activity will be a non-complying activity. This contradicts Policy NFL-P4 which stipulates providing for farming activities within ONL and ONF where there is no compromise to any identified characteristics and qualities of the ONL or ONF. It is considered that farming activities should be a permitted activity within and outside of the coastal environment.	Delete Rule NFL-R6 (inferred)		Accept
FS66.110	Bentzen Farm Limited		Support	The rule does not implement policy NFL-P4 of the Proposed Plan which recognises that that farming should be provided for in ONLs and ONFs and that the use can form part of the characteristics and values that established the landscape or feature	Allow		Accept
S96.001	Lynley Newport	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter considers it unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity. The submitter also considers the rule to	Delete NFL-R6 or amend activity status to restricted discretionary with the matters of discretion related to the matters listed in NFL-P4, i.e whether the activity will form part of the characteristics and qualities that established the		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				be inconsistent with policy NFL-P4 which provides for farming activities within an Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape.	landscape or feature; whether the activity is consistent with and does not compromise the characteristics and qualities of the landscape or feature.		
FS28.025	Dr John L Craig		Support	The submitter agrees it is unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an ONF and ONL and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity. The submitter wishes to restore vegetation across the majority of their property using a range of native species and on-going pest control. The proposed FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities.	Allow	Delete NFL-R6 or amend activity status to to restricted discretionary with the matters of discretion related to the matters listed in NFL-P4.	Accept
FS548.022	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Support	The submitter agrees it is unacceptable, unreasonable and unjustified that NFL-R6 deems farming within an ONF and ONL and outside the coastal environment, to be a discretionary activity. The submitter wishes to restore vegetation across the majority of their property using a range of native species and on-going pest control. The proposed FNDP could severely restrict future potential activities within these planted areas, and/or require resource consents for future activities.	Allow	Grant the relief sought.	Accept
S495.014	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R6	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R6		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.				
FS410.014	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept	
S67.034	Michael John Winch	NFL-R6	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Reject	
FS346.857	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject	
FS566.083	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
S495.015	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-R7	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development	Delete the non-complying activity status applying to Rule NFL-R7		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. Delete all provisions in the plan that require activities located within an identified ONL to be assessed as non-complying activities.				
FS410.015	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	
FS393.030	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S511.082	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NFL-R7	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Delete Rule NFL-R7	Reject	
FS164.082	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).	Reject
FS570.1653	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs	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
				on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.				
FS566.1667	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Reject	
FS569.1689	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	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
S442.101	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-R7	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support the rule for extending mineral extraction activities in ONL's and ONFs. The extension of such existing activities would more appropriately be non-complying in ONL's and prohibited in ONFs. This is because while ONLs may be able to absorb some further modification from quarrying activities the same can not be said for ONFs. New quarrying activities should be prohibited for both ONLs and ONFs as should new plantation forestry.	Delete Rule NFL-R7.		Reject
FS346.712	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Reject
S67.035	Michael John Winch	NFL-R7	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part
FS346.858	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.084	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S67.036	Michael John Winch	NFL-R8	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS346.859	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.085	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S67.037	Michael John Winch	NFL-R9	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the rules		Accept in part	
FS346.860	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.086	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S345.012	Nicole Way and Christopher Hujich as Trustees of the Trssh Birnie Settlement Trust	Standards	Oppose	The Resource Consents at Mataka Station enable development, and completion of the Mataka Station development, notwithstanding the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan fails to recognise, have regard to, or provide	Amend to explicitly, and specifically provide for, and preserve the activities and land uses authorised under the Resource Consents at Mataka Station. and/or		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				for the development and subdivision enabled by the Resource Consents. The Proposed District Plan provisions will restrict development of the Property, and Mataka Station more generally, in a manner that is inconsistent with the Resource Consents and the integrated and comprehensive development authorised by those. The Council's s32 analysis does not mention, or consider approved but unimplemented developments within the Property and Mataka Station more generally, nor elsewhere. The "low intensity" development controls and height limits proposed within the Coastal Environment are given very little analysis. The proposed provisions are inconsistent with the Act and relevant planning instruments.	Insert a new special purpose zone and/or structure plan together with appropriate provisions (objectives, policies and rules) enabling the residential activity and development as is authorised by the Resource Consents as a permitted activity (where they are in general accordance with the Resource Consents) as well as appropriate activities within the Rural Production Zone, regardless of the provisions of the CE, ONL or HNC. and/or Amend the provisions of the Proposed District Plan to preserve the activities and buildings authorised by the Resource Consents on the Property.		
S425.036	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust	Standards	Support in part	PHTTCCT consider that the provisions do not adequately provide for the maintenance, operation and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure in accordance with the RPS.	Amend the provisions of NFL to ensure that maintenance, operation, and upgrade of regionally significant infrastructure is provided for.	Accept in part	
S179.079	Russell Protection Society (INC)	Standards	Support	In view of the fact that coastal zones are not provided for in the Proposed district plan, then the Coastal Environment, Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscape Overlays become very important in helping to define the boundaries of Russell and in safeguarding a suitable backdrop or canvass which to interpret and appreciate the historic township. It is especially important that these overlays provide adequate protection to the headlands framing Russell and the natural coastal escarpments that characterize the balance of the Russell Peninsula. For this reason it is important to control subdivision and	Retain standards	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				development of coastal lands in the area.			
FS51.99	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS23.042	Des and Lorraine Morrison		Support in part	HNZPT is supportive of the planning framework notified for the protection of the district's Natural Character and Natural Features and Landscapes.	Allow in part	Allow relief sought to the extent relief sought is consistent with our primary submission.	Accept in part
S97.001	Lynley Newport	NFL-S1	Support in part	The submitter considers that the 5m maximum height in NFL-S1 could be increased to 6m without increasing the risk of visual impact. The submitter also considers that the wording of the remainder of the standard in #1 is too open to interpretation.	Amend NFL-S1 to read: 1. The maximum height of any new building or structure above ground level is 6m and must not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula within or adjacent to the property. Amend NFL-S1 2. similarly.		Accept in part
S277.021	Alec Jack	NFL-S1	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 & 3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		Accept in part
S333.038	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.			
S497.003	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-S1	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	
S168.046	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Reject	
S494.003	Ian Jepson	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject	
S187.038	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.			
S222.048	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Reject
S167.045	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1		Reject
FS143.17	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in all instances and, as is the case at Mataka Station has been already assessed and determined at by the subdivision consent stage.	Allow		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.407	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in all instances and, as is the case at Mataka Station has been already assessed and determined at by the subdivision consent stage.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
S493.003	William Goodfellow	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	
FS67.112	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	
FS68.110	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	
S496.002	Philip Thornton	NFL-S1	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above	Amend to remove provisions limiting the height of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.			
FS411.002	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject
S495.004	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-S1	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity.	Delete NFL-S1 (inferred).		Accept in part
FS410.004	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	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
S243.063	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S1	Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Delete Standard NFL-S1	Accept in part	
FS570.621	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS566.635	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS569.657	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The maximum height specified of 5m may or may not be appropriate in the	Disallow	Disallow to the extent	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				circumstances, and is best assessed and determined at resource consent stage for the building under NFL-R1. The height limit of the zone would otherwise apply to smaller (less than 50m structures). The requirement to not exceed the height of the nearest ridgeline, headland or peninsula as a height limit lacks precision and measurability, with these factors better taken into account at resource consent stage.		that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	
S67.038	Michael John Winch	NFL-S1	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part
FS346.861	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.087	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S277.022	Alec Jack	NFL-S2	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 & 3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		Accept in part
S333.039	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall:		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	
S497.004	Mark John Wyborn	NFL-S2	Support in part	The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive landscapes are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject
S168.047	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	Accept in part
S494.005	Ian Jepson	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.	Reject
S187.039	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%.	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
					2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	
S222.049	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	Accept in part
S502.041	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. An example of this is Coloursteel Sandstone Grey, which is a very common colour used and has an LRV of 27% but is not listed within the BS5252 colour range. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour palette range. The Resene BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is therefore outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilised. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%, the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue).	Amend NFL-S2 The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a light reflectance value no greater than 30%. ~~2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette~~ or in the event this relief is not accepted we ask that Council make the following changes - 2. If painted have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or equivalent product	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilized which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.			
S503.023	Waitangi Limited	NFL-S2	Not Stated	Reference to the BS5252 standard colour range has been removed. Many coloursteel colours, which have an LRV of less than 30% are not listed within the BS5252 standard colour palette. An example of this is Coloursteel Sandstone Grey, which is a very common colour used and has an LRV of 27% but is not listed within the BS5252 colour range. This results in consent being required for a large number of sheds/garages, dwelling roofs, which are constructed of coloursteel materials and have an LRV of less than 30%, but are not stated within the BS5252 standard colour palette range. The Resene BS5252 colour range was created in 2008 and is therefore very outdated. It also gives an unfair trade advantage to Resene where only their products can be utilized. It is considered that with the requirement of an LRV no greater than 30%, the intention of this rule will still be achieved, and will remove the need for consent for coloursteel products which have an LRV of less than 30% (as well as any other products which have the same issue). Furthermore, by deleting point 2, it enables natural wood products such as cedar to be utilized which are not painted or stained without requiring consent.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a light reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. ~~have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette.~~ In the event that the above relief is not accepted we ask that Council make the following changes to point 2 (inferred): If painted , have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or equivalent product	Accept in part	
FS51.36	Heritage New Zealand Poutere Taonga		Oppose	The Waitangi Treaty Grounds/Te Pitowhenua is the most symbolically important place in Aotearoa/New Zealand, being identified in 2019 as the first National Historic Landmark/ Ngā Manawhenua o Aotearoa me ōna	Disallow in part		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Kōrero Tūturu in accordance with the HNZPTA. As a National Landmark, HNZPT advises that the planning framework applied to the extent of the Landmark site definition (as identified in the Landmark document Listing - Te Pitowhenua Waitangi Treaty Grounds documents 2019.pdf - All Documents (sharepoint.com) must strongly support the retention and protection of the heritage resources and the heritage values of the place. The management of buildings and structures within the Waitangi Treaty Grounds, and the impact the exterior of buildings and structures must be strictly controlled to ensure the protection of the place's significant heritage values of the Treaty Grounds. Some of which are viewed from the wider setting and viewpoints, such as from Kororareka Russell. However, HNZPT is supportive of proving greater flexibility of the source of the paint through the introduction of the proposed wording "or equivalent product".			
S167.046	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS143.18	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support in part	The relief sought that buildings can be also be natural finish stone or timber is supported as both are appropriate in coastal landscapes with high values.	Allow in part		Accept in part
FS566.408	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The relief sought that buildings can be also be natural finish stone or timber is supported as both are appropriate in coastal landscapes with high values.	Disallow		Accept in part
S493.005	William Goodfellow	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject
FS67.114	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept
S159.064	Horticulture New Zealand	NFL-S2	Oppose	This standard would limit colour of cloth used in orchards.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 to include: artificial crop protection structures are either dark green or black		Reject
FS151.229	Ngāi Tukairangi No.2 Trust		Support		Allow		Reject
FS570.226	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our	Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						original submission		
FS566.240	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
FS569.262	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose		Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept	
S496.004	Philip Thornton	NFL-S2	Oppose	As a corollary to the above, the submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the overlays identified above would limit the reasonable development of land within the overlay to an extent that is unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act.	Amend to remove provisions defining the colours and reflectivity of new buildings in ONLs.		Reject	
FS411.004	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject	
S495.005	Ricky Faesen Kloet	NFL-S2	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed standards that apply to activities located within the ONL overlay would limit the reasonable development of land to an extent that is	Delete Standard NFL-S2 (inferred).		Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				unnecessarily onerous and inconsistent with the purpose of the Act. These include limitations on the height and area, and defining the colours and reflectivity			
FS410.005	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject
S243.064	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S2	Support in part	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Amend Standard NFL-S2 as follows: The exterior surfaces of buildings or structures shall: 1. be constructed of materials and/or finished to achieve a reflectance value no greater than 30%. 2. have an exterior finish within Groups A, B or C as defined within the BS5252 standard colour palette or are a natural finish stone or timber.		Accept in part
FS570.622	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
						original submission		
FS566.636	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.658	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	The rule should allow for natural materials also.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S67.039	Michael John Winch	NFL-S2	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part	
FS346.862	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.088	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S277.023	Alec Jack	NFL-S3	Oppose	Regarding the standards (NFL-S1, 2 & 3) I oppose such restrictive standards on the height of buildings, the colours	Amend standards NFL-S1, 2 & 3, so that there are more permissive standards on the		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				and materials used, and earthworks. I want the FNDC to make these standards more permissive in areas out of public view. 270ha of our land is impacted by this standard.	height of buildings, the colours and materials used, and earthworks.		
S333.040	P S Yates Family Trust	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m2). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m2 ~~over the life of the District Plan.~~ per calendar year; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of ~~4m~~ 1.5m.; and 3. screen any exposed faces ~~visible from a public place.~~; or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.		
S168.048	Setar Thirty Six Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend standard NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~over the life of the District Plan.~~ per calendar year; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 4m ~~1.5m.~~ 1.5m.; and 3. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place; or ...	Accept in part
S187.040	The Shooting Box Limited	NFL-S3	Support	Refer to submission for detailed reasons for decision(s) requested relating, but not limited to, the following: earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²); earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted; life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~over the life of the District Plan.~~ per calendar year; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 4m ~~1.5m.~~ 1.5m.; and 3. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place.;	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				ability for the land to heal each season after earthworks; and screening should only be from public places.	or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	
S222.050	Wendover Two Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m ²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (eg not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m ² ~~over the life of the District Plan.~~ per calendar year; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 4m ~~1.5m.~~ 1.5m.; and 3. screen any exposed faces visible from a public place; or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.	Accept in part
S503.024	Waitangi Limited	NFL-S3	Not Stated	Under the Proposed Plan, any site not within the ONL, ONF or coastal environment overlay, as a permitted activity can undertake an earthworks activity over an area of 2500m ² , which	Amend Standard NFL-S3 as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				is significantly greater than the 50m ² provided for over 10 years from the notification of the District Plan. 50m ² of earthworks over 10 years is very restrictive and with the changes being made to the definition of earthworks likely to trigger consent for a number of activities, including repair and maintenance activities not already covered under NFL-R2. It is considered more appropriate to allow 100m ² of earthworks per calendar year for sites within the ONF and ONL overlay. This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 100m ² area. The provision for 100m ² of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the ONF and ONL overlay are adhered to.	(where relevant): - not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~over the life of the District Plan~~ 100 m² per calendar year. - be for the purpose of establishing or maintaining an access and/or a building platform, or undertaking repair and maintenance activities which are not covered by NFL-R2. We seek clarification that where mentioned that these activities only relate to historic items as general repair and maintenance activities can generate some small scale earthworks	
S167.047	Bentzen Farm Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (ie calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply.	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): - not exceed a total area of 50m² ~~over the life of the District Plan.~~ per calendar year; and - not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 4m ~~1.5m.~~ 1.5m.; and - screen any exposed faces visible from a public place; or - be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
					clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.		
FS143.19	Mataka Residents' Association Inc		Support	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.	Allow		Accept in part
FS534.042	Waiaua Bay Farm Limited		Support in part	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.	Allow	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred)	Accept in part
FS566.409	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The relief sought is consistent with the further submitter's primary submission; namely that restrictions in the rule should not apply to earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or an approved building platform.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S511.085	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	NFL-S3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL-S3 in first instance Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the IB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part
FS164.085	Scrumptious Fruit Trust		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs	Allow	Amend HNC overlay to include Taupo Bay; Amend provisions to require strong wildlife protection; Amend provisions to	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.		require dogs on leash in beach areas; Adopt SNA and HNC provisions (inferred).		
FS548.165	Northland Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc		Oppose	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Disallow	Decline the relief sought.	Accept in part	
FS570.1656	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				being recognised as a high character area.				
FS566.1670	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1692	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	Taupo Bay foreshore and surrounds (as well as most Northland beach areas) must be designated as a SNA. There needs to be greater recognition of beaches as primarily biodiversity habitats and secondly as passive recreational spaces, thereby recognising and ensuring stronger protections for wildlife. This will ensure various other instruments such as bylaws are adopted to meet higher standards of protection of wildlife. Dogs on leashes in beach areas will help support the Northland foreshore and biodiversity recovery. The submitter supports Taupo Bay being recognised as a high character area.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S502.042	Northland Planning and Development 2020 Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Under the Proposed Plan, any site not within the ONL, ONF or coastal environment overlay, as a permitted activity can undertake an earthworks	Amend NFL-S3 Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant):		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				activity over an area of 2500m², which is significantly greater than the 50m² provided for over 10 years from the notification of the District Plan. 50m² of earthworks over 10 years is very restrictive and with the changes being made to the definition of earthworks likely to trigger consent for a number of activities, including repair and maintenance activities not already covered under NFL-R2. It is considered more appropriate to allow 100m² of earthworks per calendar year for sites within the ONF and ONL overlay. This will ensure that earthworks are controlled to a certain degree, whilst still enabling ongoing activities as well as establishment of some new buildings or structures, which do not breach the 100m² area. The provision for 100m² of earthworks per calendar year is considered to be a good compromise to ensure that the objectives and policies within the ONF and ONL overlay are adhered to. 2.13. Again with repair and maintenance we seek clarification that where mentioned that these activities only relate to historic items as general repair and maintenance activities can generate some small scale earthworks.	1. Not exceed a total area of 50m² over the life of the District Plan 100 m² per calendar year 2. Not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1m 3. Screen any exposed faces 4. Be for the purpose of establishing or maintaining an access and/or building platform, or undertaking repair and maintenance activities which are not covered by NFL-R2.		
FS354.127	Horticulture New Zealand		Support	The amendment provides for a more reasonable amount of earthworks to be undertaken.	Allow	Allow S502.042	Accept in part
S243.065	Matauri Trustee Limited	NFL-S3	Support in part	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted	Amend rule NFL-S3 (inferred) as follows: Any earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance must (where relevant): 1. not exceed a total area of 50m² over the life of the District Plan, per calendar year; and 2. not exceed a cut height or fill depth of 1m 1.5m; and 3. screen any exposed faces		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply	visible from a public place-; or 4. be for the purpose of access and/or a building platform. Note: The NESF requires a 10m setback from any natural wetland in respect of earthworks or vegetation clearance and may require consent from the Regional Council.		
FS570.623	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m ²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply				
FS566.637	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.659	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	Amendments are sought to the rule so that earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with access and/or a building platform are not subject to the preceding subclause 1-3s. Otherwise, such works would trigger the need for consent in almost every instance (building platforms generally being greater than 50m²). Also, as drafted, it could be interpreted that only earthworks and vegetation	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				clearance for the purpose of access and/or a building platform are permitted (e.g. not farming earthworks and vegetation clearance). These changes are appropriate because earthworks or indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the building is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity matter with the building resource consent application. Life of District Plan as a compliance measure is unnecessarily limited and does not recognise the ability for the land to heal each season (i.e. calendar year) after earthworks. Screening should only be from public places (which includes the CMA) for the rule to efficiently apply				
S442.104	Kapiro Conservation Trust	NFL-S3	Oppose	There is a risk that including this rule will lead to contradictions with the IB and earthwork rules.	Delete NFL-S3 in first instance, Or Amend to include conditions that ensure compliance with the OB and earthworks rules.		Accept in part	
FS346.715	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 other than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Allow	Accept in part	Reject	
S67.040	Michael John Winch	NFL-S3	Support	I generally support the provisions of the Proposed District Plan in respect of protecting natural landscape values.	retain the standards		Accept in part	
FS346.863	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	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
FS566.089	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	The amendments sought give effect to the NPS FM, the RPS, Part 2 of the RMA, and the NPSIB. Forest & Bird supports the full submission than where the relief sought would conflict with that sought in Forest & Birds submission.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S333.053	P S Yates Family Trust	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)			Accept in part
S187.053	The Shooting Box Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site			Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay).			
S364.059	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SUB-R18	Support	The Director-General supports the activity status associated with Rule SUB-R18	Retain Rule SUB-R18	Accept in part		
FS372.004	John Andrew Riddell		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	retain the rules as proposed	Accept in part	
FS570.1140	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS346.199	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	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
FS566.1154	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1176	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The rules are consistent with Part 2 of the Act, with national policy statements and with the Regional Policy Statement for Northland. The activity status set out in these rules follows sound resource management practice.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S222.054	Wendover Two Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots.	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
					Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS405.041	Sarah Ballantyne and Dean Agnew		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS361.033	Willowridge Developments Limited		Support	Ballantyne & Agnew supports the requested amendment as the Coastal Environment will not be impacted if the boundaries in this area are not subdivided, particularly where only a small part of the site is contained within the Coastal Environment.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
S243.078	Matauri Trustee Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS570.636	Vision Kerikeri 3		Oppose	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.650	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots				
FS569.672	Vision Kerikeri 2		Oppose	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole. The rule should also only be restricted to the creation of new lots within these overlays/margins and should not apply to the other classes of subdivision provided for (for example, boundary adjustments). The revisions sought in this submission seeks to limit the application of the rule only to the creation of new lots	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S167.060	Bentzen Farm Limited	SUB-R18	Support in part	On many sites the overlay or margin is a small component of a larger site. Subdivision of the balance of the site not covered by the overlay or margin should be able to occur in accordance with the standard subdivision provisions. Only where the new lot to be created (or boundary) is within the overlay should assessment be required under this rule. That may have been the intent of the drafting; however, as drafted, it may capture sites where only a part of them is within an overlay or margin yet	Amend Rule SUB-R18 as follows: SUB-R18 Subdivision of a site within an Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature (where any boundary of a new lot to be created (excluding boundary adjustments) is within that part of the existing site covered by the overlay)		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				applies the rule and activity status to subdivisions of the site as a whole.			
FS566.422	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose		Disallow		Accept in part
S282.027	Chorus New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Spark TowerCo Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Rules	Oppose	The current rules framework in relation to Natural features and landscapes does not provide for new infrastructure activities noting that in instances there may be a functional or operational need for such activities to be located in Natural Character areas. Allowing for new infrastructure (compliant with the relevant standards within the Infrastructure section) within existing road reserve would appear appropriate given the land has already been developed and therefore has a lesser degree of impact in these areas.	Amend rules to allow for new infrastructure to be established within road reserve when located within an ONL and ONF.		Accept in part
FS36.056	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency		Support	The submitter agrees that the natural features and landscapes provisions need to provide for new infrastructure activities where there is an operational and/or functional need. Waka Kotahi notes that infrastructure/transport corridors often provide vital lifeline access to communities and sometimes roads have a functional need to be located in these areas.	Allow	Allow the original submission.	Accept in part
FS111.085	Pou Herenga Tai Twin Coast Cycle Trail Charitable Trust (PHTTCCT)		Support in part	The submitter agrees that the natural features and landscapes provisions need to provide for new infrastructure activities where there is an operational and/or functional need. Waka Kotahi notes that infrastructure/transport corridors often provide vital lifeline access to communities and sometimes roads have a functional need to be located in these areas.	Allow in part	allow in part original submission	Accept in part
S216.002	Errol McIntyre	Rules	Oppose	Opposes all controls over private land because it infringes on a right to own property. Should an authority control land use, then some form of	Council should waive rates on all areas of significant natural landscapes/areas (ONL or		Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				compensation is in order. Any areas set aside as ONL or ONF should at the very least be void of rates. Why should a landowner pay rates on land they can no longer use and is there for the public good?	ONF) that the Proposed District Plan refers to.		
FS541.004	Errol James McIntyre		Support	outstanding and significant areas are protected by law for all. the landowner should not be paying rates on such land	Allow	Council should consider areas of significance protected by RM, be exempt from rates	Reject
S364.078	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 5 - Schedule of Outstanding natural landscapes		Accept in part
FS570.1159	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part
FS346.218	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part
FS566.1173	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS569.1195	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural landscapes, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S364.079	Director-General of Conservation (Department of Conservation)	SCHED6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features	Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Retain Schedule 6 - Schedule of Outstanding natural features		Accept in part	
FS570.1160	Vision Kerikeri 3		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS346.219	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.1174	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
FS569.1196	Vision Kerikeri 2		Support	The Director-General supports the Council to identify, map and protect outstanding natural features, especially those within the coastal environment in line the NZCPS.	Allow	Allow to the extent that the submission is consistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S277.024	Alec Jack	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Jacks Lake is not a natural feature - it is man-made and was created by Ned Jack with financial assistance (50% subsidy for habitat creation) from the Acclimatization Society (now Fish and Game NZ) in 1975. I will provide multiple levels of evidence at the hearings stage. I also oppose the inclusion of our land immediately adjacent to Lake Owhareiti in the ONF91 classification. Lake Owhareiti itself dictates its boundary, not a land title, or a line on a map. The farmland adjacent to the lake isn't an outstanding natural feature.	Amend the Planning Maps to exclude Jacks Lake, and Lake Owhareiti foreshore area on our farm from area classified "ONF91 Pouerua (Pakaraka Mountain) scoria cone, lava field and lava-dammed lakes".	Accept in part	
S420.007	Muriwhenua Incorporated	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.	Accept in part	
S91.013	PF Olsen Limited	Outstanding Natural Feature	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Feature, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted.	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Features overlay mapping.	Accept in part	
FS108.21	Manulife Forest Management		Support	As described by the original submitter.	Allow		Accept in part

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
FS566.102	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	As described by the original submitter.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	
S148.031	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Feature	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONF overlay mapping		Accept in part	
FS85.51	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS85.54	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment,	Allow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.				
FS346.537	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.143	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S242.002	Zeja Hu	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506). The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and those areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission. The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay. The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays. Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3. Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being categorised as 'Non-Complying'! As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that:	Accept in part	
					a. constructing a dwelling and undertaking other customary associated activities, and b. undertaking Farming activities on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and unreasonable burden on the landowner.		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B). In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the environment or any person significantly. The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules). With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe. There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.			
S75.001	Denis Whooley and Jennifer Whooley	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The photograph of 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa, that has been used to overlay Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) is woefully out of date and does not reflect the following: -Several kilometres of roading in place -Acres of land clearance -Buildings insitu -Resource consents for buildings not yet constructed	Delete Outstanding natural landscape 57 (Russell Forest and bush remnants) from 2195 Waikare Road, Russell/Kawakawa	Reject	
S497.002	Mark John Wyborn	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the ONL overlay be removed from that part of the submitter's property [illustrated in the submission] that do not have these qualities such that the submitter can continue to use and develop his land in a manner consistent with its current residential use.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Orokawa 3C 2A Block NA17A/1419 (187A Manawaora Road, Russell) [as illustrated in submission].	Reject	
S242.001	Zejia Hu	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The policies and rules in the 'Natural features and landscapes' chapter of the PDP have an impact on the future development options for 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506). The property is rated as vacant lifestyle. Amongst other overlays, the property is subject to Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and High Natural Character (HNC) overlays. Much of the property is bush covered and those	Amend the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay on 79C Peninsula Parade, Hihi (being legally described as Lot 1, DP 322506) and/or modify the PDP rules such that: a. constructing a dwelling and undertaking other customary associated activities, and b. undertaking Farming activities	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				areas are not developable for reasons stated in submission. The only potentially practically developable area (i.e. for residential unit) on the property will be subject to a proposed Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay. The rules in the PDP applying to this developable land area mean I would not have the right to construct a dwelling and undertake activities customarily associated with such on the property, particularly the combination of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Coastal Environment overlays. Rule NFL-R1, would, given the circumstances described above, mean the construction of a residential unit on the property would be categorised as 'Non-Complying', as would, almost certainly, the minimum reasonably required earthworks associated with constructing any reasonably dimensioned dwelling, due to rule NFL-R3 and the extreme limitations associated with standard NFL-S3. Also, ironically, despite the property being proposed to be zoned Rural Production, NFL-R6 results in all farming activity on the property being categorised as 'Non-Complying'! As a consequence of the matters outlined above, it is demonstrably the case that without amendment, the PDP as Notified would have the effect of making the property incapable of reasonable use and would place an unfair and unreasonable burden on me (per RMA S.85 3B). In terms of the definition of 'reasonable use' in S. 85, I assert that permitting me to have the right to build a dwelling and all customary associated constructions and other associated activities on the property would not adversely affect the environment or any person significantly.	on the non-bush covered areas of the property would be classed as a permitted or controlled activity, thereby avoiding the property being rendered incapable of reasonable use and avoiding placing an unfair and unreasonable burden on the landowner.	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				The Northland Regional Landscape Assessment Workshop report for the ONL that covers the property (Ref ONL 17, ONL Number 2847) does not specifically reference the pastured areas that are the areas where I am objecting to the impact of the ONL overlay (in conjunction with other overlays and other PDP rules). With regard to the eastern side of the harbour, the assessment largely focusses on the bush covered coastal fringe. There are already a number of dwellings and other structures in this area visible from the other side of the Mangonui Harbour that the FNDC has either given consent to, or allowed to be constructed without consent. These existing and in progress constructions and associated earthworks are clearly visible from the Rangikapiti Historic Reserve and from various vantage points on the harbour itself. It would be intolerable for me not to be permitted to build in this area where Council has tolerated unconsented (non-Permitted) building and earthworks activity for many years. Given the nature of the location and price of the land in this area, it is reasonable to assume any reasonable minded owner wishing to construct a dwelling on the property would ensure it was architecturally designed in keeping with the aesthetic values of the surrounds, with appropriate softening of the visual affects by native tree plantings etc (and compliance with relevant standards and rules in the PDP beyond the standards and rules that directly relate to this objection). It would not be a public 'eye sore' and therefore I should have the right to undertake such constructions and associated activities		

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested	Hearings Panel Recommendation
				as permitted activities, or at worst as controlled activities.		
S494.001	Ian Jepson	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	Lot 3 DP 48494 has imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays appear to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and do not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings, extensive lawns, outbuildings and roading. The majority of the site is devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Lot 3 DP 48494.	Reject
S353.002	Amanda Kennedy, Julia Kennedy Till and Simon Till	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Support	The reasons why it is believed that the proposed changes are more appropriate for this site are: - it better aligns with existing development, size of landholdings and underlying characteristics and qualities of the land; - the approach proposed is more consistent with high order Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA') policies and plans; and - the approach proposed is more consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	Retain parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscape which applies to NA125B/204 (Lot 1 DP 197131). If the primary relief above is not proposed, the submitters further seek that: the Management Plan approach be retained in the PDP, with further measures that enable sites (such as the Landholdings under consideration) to be appropriately developed.	Reject
S491.002	Eric Kloet	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213) is a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds. The area enjoys an attractive aesthetic, but due to the predominantly human landscape qualities exhibited by the specific property and others within close	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Waipohutukawa Bay (Lots 5 and 18 of DP 391213)	Reject

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				proximity, which include significant buildings and infrastructure as well as roading it cannot be considered to meet the high bar of having the landscape values ascribed to it over the whole of the subject site. The imposition of controls intended to manage development in highly sensitive areas are inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained. Therefore, the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with the present planning regimen.			
S490.002	Owen Burn	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay is inappropriate and impose unduly restrictive controls on the reasonable use and development of the site and adjacent land. The high natural character overlay does not reflect the existing state of the subject property or the surrounding land, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing dwellings located within extensively developed and landscaped grounds	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Orokawa 3A1, Orokawa Bay (identified in the submission)	Reject	
S492.002	Ironwood Trust Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission) does not reflect the state of the subject property as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape containing buildings and other domestic infrastructure with the majority of the land not having qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from the property at Jack's Bay and Waipiro Bay (see submission)	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
S420.009	Muriwhenua Incorporated	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	Not stated	Delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from the Māori Purposes Rural Settlement zone area proposed through submission point S420.004. In addition, delete the outstanding natural features classification and outstanding natural landscape overlays from that part of the Te Hāpua and Shenwood Forests that is greater than 500 metres from the coast.	Reject	
S493.001	William Goodfellow	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	In particular the submitter considers that these overlays do not reflect the state of the subject property or the surrounding land as it currently is, which is that of a developed and modified human landscape. In particular much of the land holding to the east of Rawhiti Road is given over to plantation forestry which has been recently harvested. In addition, land to the west of this road has recently been subdivided such that it will ultimately be developed for residential use. Accordingly, and as is evident from the aerial photograph below, the majority of the land is in reality devoid of any landscape qualities that could reasonably be described as having high natural character or comprise an outstanding natural landscape.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from parcels on Rawhiti Road, Rawhiti (identified in the submission).	Reject	
FS67.110	The Shooting Box Limited		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the	Disallow		Accept

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.				
FS68.108	P S Yates Family Trust		Oppose	The further submitter is concerned about the potential effects on landscape and visual amenity and coastal character with the removal of all controls on height, area, colour and reflectivity of buildings as would be the outcome of this submission point, whether by way of removing the overlays or by way of removing the specific controls referred to by the submitter.	Disallow		Accept	
S148.030	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The chapter on Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) fails to provide equitably for all primary production activities. In particular, it fails to recognise that, where plantation forestry already exists within an ONL or ONF, it should be considered as a legitimate part of the landscape and provided for as a permitted activity subject to the provisions of the NES-PF	Delete any areas of existing plantation forestry for the ONL overlay mapping		Accept in part	
FS85.52	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Allow		Accept in part	
FS85.53	PF Olsen Ltd		Support	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take	Allow		Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.				
FS346.536	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur. Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	
FS566.142	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	PF Olsen supports changing the planning maps. The plan needs to take into consideration forestry activity as long land use activity and existing use of land as per s 20A. There is no recognition of existent plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment, Outstanding Natural Landscape, or High Natural Character layers. Besides, more stringent rules in these layers will affect current plantation forests with no s 32 consideration or justification for this to occur.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested		Hearings Panel Recommendation
				Lastly, there needs to be more consistency between the planning maps and the rules PRROZ-O1, PRROZ-O3, PRROZ-O4 and PRROZ-P1.			
S91.012	PF Olsen Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	Plantation forests and plantation forestry activities are primary production activities in a working rural landscape. Where plantation forest already exists within an Outstanding Natural Landscape, it should be considered as a permitted activity and the associated plantation forest activities should also be permitted.	Delete any areas of plantation forest from the Outstanding Natural Landscapes overlay mapping.	Accept in part	
FS196.245	Joe Carr		Support	tautoko	Allow		Accept in part
FS566.101	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		Oppose	tautoko	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part
S496.001	Philip Thornton	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The submitter considers that the ONL overlay should be removed from this site such that the submitter can continue to use his land in a manner consistent with its evident landscape characteristics.	Amend to remove Outstanding Natural Landscape from Waipohutukawa Bay, Bay of Islands (Lot 4 DP 391213) [as illustrated in submission].	Reject	
FS411.001	Omarino Residents Association		Support	The Omarino residents association considers that these areas should be excluded from the ONL overlay and associated controls as anticipated by the subdivision consent, particularly given that the design conditions imposed by the subdivision consent render such controls nugatory.	Allow	remove the ONL overlay from all of the areas specified in Condition 9 of the subdivision consent as attached.	Reject
S495.002	Ricky Faesen Kloet	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Oppose	The overlay appears to have been painted with a rather 'broad brush' and does not reflect the environment of the	Delete the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from Lot 6 DP 488661, Motuarohia Island.	Reject	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
				western end of Motuarohia Island and the subject property in particular. This part of Motuarohia Island is largely developed with holiday homes with domestic infrastructure. While these sites contain stands of bush these are discontinuous and do not create a coherent natural landscape unit. When considered in its entirety it does not exhibit the landscape qualities that could not reasonably be described as having high natural character. The overlay is inappropriate in this context and will make the reasonable use and development of the property unfairly and unnecessarily constrained.				
FS410.002	Craig Heatley		Support	I am particularly concerned that the site in the ownership of the submitter has also imposed upon it the HNC and ONL overlays. These overlays do not reflect the environment of the subject property which is largely developed with two houses and domestic infrastructure occupying the curtilages surrounding the dwellings. While the site contain some bush this is discontinuous and does not create a coherent natural landscape unit. As such the part of Moturua island within which the site is located has all the characteristics of that of a developed and modified human landscape.	Allow	allow the original submission	Reject	
S148.053	Summit Forests New Zealand Limited	Outstanding Natural Landscape	Not Stated	The Plan's overlays for Outstanding Natural Landscapes captures significant areas of SFNZ's plantation forests. This could create uncertainty and open SFNZ to challenge over its legitimate plantation forestry activities in these areas.	Delete any Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay from plantation forest areas		Accept in part	
FS346.559	Royal Forest and Bird Protection		Oppose	The amendments sought will result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values which is inconsistent with council's	Disallow	Disallow the original submission	Accept in part	

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Position	Reasons	Summary of Decision Requested			Hearings Panel Recommendation
	Society of New Zealand Inc.			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. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.				
FS566.165	Kapiro Conservation Trust 2		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. Loss of natural character, coastal environment values and the values of outstanding landscapes could also result.	Disallow	Disallow to the extent that the submission is inconsistent with our original submission	Accept in part	