

**Summary of Submissions and Further Submissions on
Variation 1: Landscapes to the Proposed Kaipara District Plan**

September 2011

INDEX OF TOPICS - Summary of Submissions and Further Submissions - Variation 1 to the Proposed Kaipara District Plan -

Topic	Page Number
Appendices	1
Defintiions	24
Extent and Quality of OLA	26
Extent and Quality of VAL	81
General Policy Framework	117
How to Use this Chapter of the District Plan - 18.4	118
Introduction	119
Invalid	122
Issue	123
Landscape Technical Report 2010	131
Mapping	132
Method	137
Miscellaneous	140
Network Utilities	233
NRPS	234
NZCPS 2010	259
Objective	261
Other Methods	266
Outcome	267
Part 2 Matters	269
Policy	272
Property Rights	289
Resource Management Act Requirements 18.2	335
Rules	336
Whole Variation	372

Note: The Invalid Submissions referred to in the 'topic' column of the tables refers to submissions that did not have any contact details recorded on the submission form (or any attachments), or did not have any recorded submission points.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	42	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18a	Oppose	The purpose and practical application of Appendix 18A is not clear.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
378	33	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	The wording of Appendix A should make it clear that the listed 'key characteristics' and 'character' are factors contributing to a landscape being assessed as outstanding, and are not a requirement or the sole basis for it to be considered outstanding.	Amend Appendix A with wording provided by submitter.
397	31	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	It should be clear that the listed 'key characteristics' and 'character' are factors to a landscape being assessed as 'outstanding' and are not a requirement or the sole basis for making this determination.	No specific decision sought.
397	32	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	Appendix 18A needs minor formatting amendments.	Some characteristics need to be put on separate lines.
397	33	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	Inclusion of 'no visible weeds' questioned within Appendix 18A.	Clarify what constitutes 'no visible weeds' and what is 'visible'.
397	34	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	Appendix 18A needs amendment for clarification and correction purposes.	Amend Appendix 18A as proposed within the submission.
451	33	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Appendices	Appendix 18a	In Part	The wording of Appendix A should make it clear that the listed 'key characteristics' and 'character' are factors contributing to a landscape being assessed as outstanding, and are not a requirement or the sole basis for it to be considered outstanding.	Amend Appendix A with wording provided by submitter.
494	2	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Appendices	Appendix 18a	Support	Supports Appendix 18A as a whole.	No decision sought.
498	7	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Appendices	Appendix 18a	N/A	Appendix 18A is not referred to in any objective, policy or rule and its relationship to Appendices 18B and C is weak.	Delete Appendix 18A.
589[498]	22	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18a	Support	Supports submission 498/7.	Accept submission 498/7.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
137	9	Dalbeth, Valerie	Appendices	Appendix 18b	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to Appendix 18 being applied to private land	The submitter seeks that Appendix 18 not apply to privately owned land.
283	43	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18b	Oppose	Information obtained / provided is insufficient to understand why areas have been or have not been included.	Remove all references to VALS from Variation 1.
378	34	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Appendix 18B is frequently referred to in Chapter 18. Where it is described as 'identifying specific values', this is considered incorrect.	Appendix 18B should be referred to accurately.
385	1	Beskeen, Andrew	Appendices	Appendix 18b	Oppose	Identification of OLAs and VALs is overly subjective.	Delete assessment criteria for Appendix B, and/or subjectivity in the criteria.
397	35	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Appendix 18B is incorrectly described as identifying 'specific values'. The values are identified in the technical report.	Appendix 18B should include the value of each identified landscape and a commentary on potential threats to landscape values from development.
397	37	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Appendix 18B and the technical report 2010 needs revising and updating for accuracy and comprehensiveness.	Undertake revisions and updating of Appendix 18B and the technical report 2010.
397	38	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Minor word amendments are needed for the description of OLAs 1 - 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 20 in Appendix 18B for accuracy and clarification purposes.	Amend wording within the description of OLAs 1 - 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 20 as set out in the submission.
397	39	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	OLA 14 description needs updating in Appendix 18B to reference the Waipu Ecological District PNAP 2007.	Amend description of OLA 14 as proposed within the submission.
397	40	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	The description of OLA 18 within Appendix 18B needs updating to reference the Waipu Ecological District PNAP 2007.	Update OLA 18 description as proposed within the submission.
397	41	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	The description of OLA 19 needs updating to provide for word corrections and to include a more detailed description of the ecology and use of the OLA.	Update the description of OLA 19 as set out in the submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	42	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18b	N/A	Minor word changes are needed for the description of VALs 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 38, 40, 45 and 46 in Appendix 18B for clarification purposes.	Update the descriptions of VALs 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 38, 40, 45 and 46 in Appendix 18B as set out in the submission.
451	34	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Appendix 18B is frequently referred to in Chapter 18. Where it is described as 'identifying specific values', this is considered incorrect.	Appendix 18B should be referred to accurately.
464	19	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	OLAs within Appendix 18B should be referenced back to Appendix 18A.	Reference each OLA in Appendix 18B back to the key physical characteristics in Appendix 18A.
570[464]	1	Vincent, Robert Marshall	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Supports submission 464/19	Allow submission 464/19
464	20	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	VALs should be removed until the boundaries are defined and agreed with landowners.	Reference the VALs in Appendix 18B back to the Key Physical Characteristics in Appendix 18A.
570[464]	2	Vincent, Robert Marshall	Appendices	Appendix 18b	Support	Supports submission 464/20	Allow submission 464/20
464	21	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Appendix 18B needs to be accurate and the most current description.	Update the descriptions in Appendix 18B to be current and accurate.
570[464]	3	Vincent, Robert Marshall	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Supports submission 464/21	Allow submission 464/21
494	3	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Appendices	Appendix 18b	Support	Supports in general Appendix 18B and in particular the inclusion of a number of OLAs and VALs as stated within the submission (OLA 1-6, 11, 22, 23; VAL 1, 4, 16, 22, 18, 46 and those covering wetlands).	No decision sought.
498	5	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Outstanding Natural Features are not addressed in Variation 1 but are sensitive to land disturbance activities.	Include locations and descriptions of outstanding natural features in Appendix 18B.
602[498]	1	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Appendices	Appendix 18b	In Part	Opposes submission 498/5	Disallow submission 498/5
110	3	Hogan, Jonathon	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
137	3	Dalbeth, Valerie	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
141	3	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
142	3	Murray, Reade Patrick	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
143	3	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
147	3	Engeler, George	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
15	1	Drury, Graham Maxwell	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Assessment criterion 18c(a) is ambiguous. It should be consistent with, and not contrary to, all of the objectives, policies and outcomes.	Amend Appendix 18c(a) to 'the proposal is consistent with all, and contrary to none of the objectives, policies and outcomes'.
153	3	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
154	5	Taylor, Joan Eva	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
162	3	Finncane, Gary Philip Morris	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Identifying private land as subject to specific criteria removes private property rights and interferes with rights of use.	Exclude specific areas from the Variation and additional assessment criteria that applies.
166	3	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
169	3	Mulherm, M E	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
170	3	Hadlow, C L	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
171	3	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
173	3	Sills, Val Winston	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
174	5	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
176	3	Jones, Graham Laurence	Appendices	Appendix 18c	N/A	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
177	4	Awhitu, Lucy	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
185	4	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
190	5	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
229	3	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
235	3	Forrest, Logan James	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
239	4	Russell, Keith Ernest	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
245	5	Legarth, Larson	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
246	4	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
247	3	Percy, Rachel	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Reporting requirements for consent applications are onerous.	Remove assessment criteria for VALs.
25	23	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Additional criterion should be inserted in Appendix 18C relating to local, regional or national benefits of an activity (in particular infrastructure).	Insert additional criterion 'U' within Appendix 18c with wording suggested by the submitter to recognise local, regional and national benefits of activity.
602[25]	4	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Supports in part submission 25/23	Allow submission 25/23
255	3	Hogan, Jonathon Peter	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment criteria in 18C (a-w) is not quantifiable.	More measurable and quantifiable criteria
258	4	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes all 23 assessment criteria and their wording in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	5	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the word 'rarity' in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	6	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the use of the word 'visibility' of the landscape.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	7	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the term 'aesthetic values' in Appendix 18C	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
258	8	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the term 'the extent of visible change'	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	9	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the term 'the degree of visual intrusion on the landscape'.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	10	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes 'the design of any building or any development' in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	11	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the text: 'The potential for more than minor adverse effects on the landscape' in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	12	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the text: 'The relationship of people' in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks more specificity and measurable wording for the assessment criteria.
258	13	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictions in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks that the words 'land use' are included in Appendix 18C to include farm related earthworks activities and to counterbalance the restrictions
258	14	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the text: 'The degree to retain the qualities' in Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks that this criteria should be much more specific and quantitative.
589[258]	27	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 258/4.	Accept submission 258/4.
259	3	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
263	3	Draper, William	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
264	3	Fernandez, Jenni	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
273	3	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
274	3	Poole, Raymond George	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
275	2	Stevens, Gary	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Unreasonable and unfair to identify and apply specific criteria to privately owned land. Doing so removes property rights, increases costs and restricts land use.	Amend existing bylaws to apply without identifying specific areas.
276	3	Robinson, Perrin	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
278	3	Miller, James Wynard	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
279	3	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
280	3	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
281	3	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
283	44	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment criteria provision suggests all resource consents must have regard to Appendix 18C. The assessment criteria are unclear and subjective.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	45	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment Criteria (a) defaults an application to non-complying status.	Delete Assessment Criteria (a).
283	46	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment Criteria (b) requires compliance with non-statutory documents.	Delete Assessment Criteria (b).
283	47	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The intent of Assessment Criteria (c) – (i) is unclear.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	48	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment Criteria (k) is subjective and is inappropriate for Council to assess.	Delete Assessment Criteria (k).
283	49	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Council to be mindful of the costs associated with Assessment Criteria (o).	Delete Assessment Criteria (o).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	50	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment Criteria (p) undermines the subdivision allotment rules. The intent is not clear.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	51	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The intent of Assessment Criteria (r) is not clear.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
284	3	Andrew, L J and N E	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
285	3	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
286	6	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
287	3	MacLean, Angus	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
288	3	Jeffer Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
289	3	Guest, W J and N M	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
291	5	McShane, Owen	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes the assessment criteria in Appendix 18C as they are so far ranging and open-ended.	The submitter seeks that the assessment criteria of Appendix 18C are withdrawn and replaced with a smaller number that are not as open-ended. Failing this, the submitter seeks the whole proposed district plan is withdrawn.
589[291]	10	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 291/5.	Accept submission 291/5.
293	3	Lulich, Leonard S	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
294	3	Williamson, Robert John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
295	3	Brown, Stuart WJ	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
296	3	Woodcock, Rodney	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
612[296]	3	Woodcock, Rodney	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/3.	Disallow submission 296/3.
297	3	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
298	3	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
300	3	Stopher, Allan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
301	3	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
302	3	Howard, Marie Hazel	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
303	3	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
304	3	Sapiatzer, Peter	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
305	3	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
306	3	Walker, John and Sjannie	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
307	3	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
308	3	Bull, Josph Arthur	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
309	3	Urlich, Lorraine Tereza	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
310	3	Savage, Keith and Velma	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
311	3	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
312	3	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
313	3	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
314	3	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
316	3	Hardy, Isabell	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
317	3	House, Stuart Henderson	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
318	3	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
319	3	Otway, Brian Kay	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
320	3	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
321	3	Smith, Kevin and Merilyn	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
322	3	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
323	3	Kemp, Harry	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
324	3	Subritzky, Desmond	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
326	3	Appleton, Gordon George	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
327	3	Bennett, Kawyn	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
328	3	Reed, Douglas	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
329	3	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
3	3	Sellars, Chris	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
330	3	Taurua, Bernice	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
331	3	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
335	3	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
336	3	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
337	3	Ruiterman, A T	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
338	3	Linton, David	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
339	3	Davies, Rhys John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
341	3	Ballantyne, I K	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
342	3	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
343	3	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
345	3	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
347	3	Gatti, Susan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
348	3	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
349	3	Williams, Murray	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
350	3	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
351	3	Lees, Tom	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
352	3	Donegan, Julia	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
353	3	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
354	3	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
355	3	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
356	3	Appleton, Lester Winston	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
357	3	Reid, R T S	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
358	3	He, Lisa	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
361	3	Lusty, David James	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
362	3	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
363	3	Vallance, John And Cathy	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
364	3	Warnes, Stuart	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
365	3	Wood, Steven and Susan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
366	3	McEvoy, R J and A	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
367	3	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
368	3	Robinson, Asa	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
369	3	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
370	3	Brown, Aland and Judith	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
371	8	Preston, Alan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Propose provision for community input into consideration of criteria listed in Appendix C by way of a Visual Amenity Design Panel for each district/ward to advise on Visual Amenity Values.	Commitment to local input into the assessment of criteria listed in Appendix C.
371	9	Preston, Alan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Assessor of Appendix 18C criteria should be aware of site and not rely solely on maps, drawings and plans.	Support Appendix C but include mandatory site visit for assessor.
589[371]	28	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 371/9.	Reject submission 371/9.
371	10	Preston, Alan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Assessment criteria in Appendix 18C(e) relates to poorly developed culture and heritage sections of the District Plan.	Review and update District Plan provisions relating to culture and heritage.
373	22	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks that Appendix 18C is reworded to provide greater protection of important and prominent views and viewshafts.
589[373]	3	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes 373/22.	Reject 373/22.
602[373]	3	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/22	Disallow submission 373/22
378	36	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Submitter supports Appendix C with amendments.	Amend with wording provided by submitter to delete provision of screening as an option for mitigation.
379	2	Roadley, Rex	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Submitter has views to an OLA. Concern of subjection to Appendix 18c and a requirement to apply for resource consents for farming activities currently undertaken. Ability to farm land will be inhibited.	Remove Appendix 18c.
381	3	Ward, Allison Anne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
383	2	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter opposes Appendix 18c, especially in regards to privately owned land.	No decision sought.
385	3	Beskeen, Andrew	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Appendix C is overly subjective.	Delete assessment criteria for Appendix C, and/or subjectivity in the criteria.
387	3	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
388	3	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
389	3	Malam, Anne Marie	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
392	3	Anderson, Audrey	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
394	3	Borger, Bert	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	When considering the effects of activities within an VAL, visual criteria should be solely assessed.	Amend Appendix C to consider visual criteria only.
589[394]	26	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 394/3.	Reject submission 394/3.
395	14	Calveley, C	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Variation should determine whether a property requires control for outstanding landscape protection. Some matters already determined in the s32 assessment.	Delete Appendix 18c (a) – (g), (p), (s), and (t), [or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners].
589[395]	45	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	14	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Variation should determine whether a property requires control for outstanding landscape protection. Some matters already determined in the s32 assessment.	Delete Variation in entirety, delete Appendix 18c (a) – (g), (p), (s), and (t), or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	59	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	43	Hawley, Catherine and John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Supports the criteria of Appendix 18C with minor amendments needed.	Amend criteria a) and h) as proposed in the submission including removal of reference to screening as a mitigation measure.
589[397]	1	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes 397/43.	Reject 397/43.
399	3	Ward, Chris	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.
404	3	Sidwell, Craig	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
407	18	Nickolson, Dave	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
414	3	Green, Donna	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
416	3	Blitvic, Dwayne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
418	5	Wills, Edward	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
422	3	Blitvic, Elaine	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
424	3	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective	No decision sought
425	2	Jones, Elizabeth	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Requirements are in part onerous, irrelevant and/or too broad.	Delete assessment criteria relating to VALS.
428	3	Hooker, Gary	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
430	4	Fish, Isabel	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
438	2	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The submitter states that Variation 1 - Landscapes could be deemed contradictory to sections 223 and 287 of the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993.	Maori land be excluded from criteria of Appendix 18C.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[438]	14	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
439	3	Anderson, Innes McRae	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
440	3	Blitvic, Ivan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
443	3	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
444	10	Elliott, Jan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter supports in part Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks that there is review and updating of the District Plan provisions referring to culture and heritage and that there is commitment to local input into the assessment of criteria listed in Appendix C.
449	3	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
450	18	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
451	36	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Submitter supports Appendix C with amendments.	Amend with wording provided by submitter deleting provision of screening as an option for mitigation.
589[451]	6	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Opposes submission 451/36.	Reject submission 451/36.
453	19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18C.	The submitter seeks that Appendix 18C is amended to read as shown in their submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
455	3	Douglas Hilton Family Trust : Wood, Wynyard :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The permanent legal protection in Appendix 18C (o) and (p) do not include land covenants in perpetuity but are more flexible. Need to account for changes in circumstances.	Participation in submission and hearing process to ensure land development potential and efficient operation of a dairy farm is not unreasonably affected.
589[455]	25	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 455/3.	Reject submission 455/3.
456	3	Jepson, Craig	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
460	1	Starr, John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	The submitter supports Appendix 18C (j).	The submitter states that better control of the ridgeline needs to happen, more stringent application of these criteria needs to take place to prevent ridgeline intrusion/breaks
462	3	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
463	12	Kaipara District Council :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter states that there are no specific criteria in Appendix 18C requiring as assessment of how the activity or subdivision may affect the cultural values of an outstanding landscape.	The submitter seeks that an additional criterion be added to Appendix 18C: '(ta) The extent to which the activity may affect the cultural values of the landscape.' In addition, the following explanation text should be included: 'In assessing this criteria, consideration will be given to: whether consultation has been undertaken with Iwi and any feedback received; whether the landscape (or part of it) is in a Site of Significance to Maori or is within the Treaty Settlement Zone. If the landscape is within the Treaty Settlement Zone, the application should reference any relevant part of the Deeds of Settlement'.
589[463]	70	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/12.	Reject submission 463/12.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
602[463]	2	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/12	Disallow submission 463/12
589[464]	72	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 464/20.	Accept submission 464/20.
464	22	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	No need for additional list of assessment criteria as long as the proposal is consistent with and not contrary to the Objectives, Policies and Outcomes of the Chapter.	Delete Appendix 18C and replace with wording suggested in the submission or retain Appendix 18C and remove criteria a, b, o and g and add an additional criterion as suggested in the submission. Make consequential amendments from this decision to the Chapters.
465	3	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
467	3	Dugdale, Kenneth	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
469	3	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
471	2	Nicholas, Kevin and Judy	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Excessive protection of Landscapes resulting in large impact on private property rights.	Remove provision (0) of Appendix 18C
577[471]	2	Simpkin, William	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Oppose submission 471/2	Disallow submission 471/2
588[471]	2	Leigh-MacKenzie, Chris	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Support.	Accept.
477	3	Davey, Louanne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
483	3	Baines, Martin Hamer	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
484	31	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	Supports the thrust of the criteria in Appendix C.	Endorsement of the criteria listed in Appendix C.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[484]	4	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes 484/31.	Reject 484/31.
484	32	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	There should be provision for community input into the consideration criteria listed in Appendix C. The submitter suggests that a Visual Amenity Design Panel of recognised local experts be formed to advise on visual issues from a community perspective.	Commitment to ensuring local input into the assessment of criteria listed in Appendix C.
486	24	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Provisions in Appendix C are unnecessary. These assessment criteria duplicate assessment criteria already detailed in the Plan (e.g. criterion (a), (n)), and it is considered inappropriate to require assessment of the consistency with documents and provisions that are not included in the District Plan nor are subject to the District Plan development process. It is also considered improper to pre-determine those activities that are inappropriate (e.g. subdivision, use and development) in assessment criteria.	Appendix C should be deleted. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
589[486]	9	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 486/24.	Accept submission 486/24.
491	3	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
492	18	Grierson, Monique	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
494	5	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports Appendix 18C.	No decision sought.
589[494]	5	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 494/5.	Reject submission 494/5.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
498	6	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	N/A	Outstanding Natural Features are not addressed in Variation 1 but are sensitive to land disturbance activities.	Include specific criteria for ONF in Appendix 18c. Suggested wording is provided.
589[498]	23	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 498/6.	Reject submission 498/6.
498	8	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	N/A	Criteria 18C(e) and 18C(t) are more related to identification of the OLA than assessing impacts.	Amend Criteria 18C(e)and 18C(t) as recommended in the submission.
589[498]	24	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 498/8.	Reject submission 498/8.
499	8	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18C Additional Assessment Criteria (in relation to the Rules in Chapter 10 - Network Utilities).	The submitter seeks that the matters for Council's discretion in Appendix 18C be reduced for provisions 10.11.2 and 10.11.3, to just (e), (g), (n) and (k).
598[499]	8	Stuart, Helen	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/8.	Disallow submission 499/8.
560[499]	8	Stuart, Ian William	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/8.	Disallow submission 499/8.
499	9	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18C Additional Assessment Criteria (in relation to the Rules in Chapter 10 - Network Utilities).	The submitter seeks that additional matters of discretion specific to electricity and telecommunications be added. Necessity of the activity to sustain the network should be considered.
589[499]	63	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 499/9.	Accept submission 499/9.
598[499]	9	Stuart, Helen	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/9.	Disallow submission 499/9.
560[499]	9	Stuart, Ian William	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/9.	Disallow submission 499/9.
499	10	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18C Additional Assessment Criteria (in relation to the Rules in Chapter 10 - Network Utilities).	The submitter seeks that objectives, policies and outcomes of Chapter 10 should also be considered where OLA and existing networks coincide.
598[499]	10	Stuart, Helen	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/10.	Disallow submission 499/10.
560[499]	10	Stuart, Ian William	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/10.	Disallow submission 499/10.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
502	3	Halse, Robyne	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
503	3	Cullen, Shane Noel	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The inclusion of Appendix 18C will require development outside the OLAs and VALs to be assessed against Appendix 18C, requiring specialist input and additional costs.	Undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to concerns raised.
504	3	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
506	3	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
510	3	Fish, Terence Henry	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
514	3	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
517	8	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter supports the Assessment Criteria in Appendix 18C and suggests that additional criteria for identifying what constitutes a Visual Amenity Landscape are developed.	The submitter seeks that the Assessment Criteria in Appendix 18C are retained and the following introductory paragraph is inserted: 'The matters set out in s104 and s105, and in Part 2 of the Act, apply to the consideration of all resource consents for land use, development and subdivision, use and development activities. In addition to these matters and the general assessment criteria provided within the relevant chapter of the Plan, the following additional criteria shall also be considered. These criteria have been cross-referenced in the Zone Chapters in this Plan and will be triggered where a resource consent is required. Advice Note: For the avoidance of doubt a Visual Amenity Landscape is not considered a natural area for the purposes of the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2010.'

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
517	9	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	In Part	The submitter supports Appendix 18C in part but does not accept that VAL's would be considered 'natural areas' for the purposes of the NESETA as there are no rules that apply to such areas, only criteria in the event of a consent being triggered for other reasons.	The submitter seeks that a clause is included in Appendix 18C, which states that for the avoidance of doubt VAL's are not considered a natural area for the purposes of the NESETA.
518	11	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns over future development potential of Baldrock Estate in relation to the assessment criteria included in Appendix C. A commercial quarrying activity would potentially be a non-complying activity resource consent which could not be granted if it is inconsistent with District Plan objectives and policies.	No decision specified.
518	12	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	Assessment criteria unclear and subjective. To address it, any resource consent application would require specialist input which could be expensive.	The inclusion of Appendix C is not supported.
526	6	Goulding, Timothy	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
553	3	Paterson, CR and CL	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
555	3	Carter, W M	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
70	7	Smith, Edward John	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
8	4	Underwood, Kenneth	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
604[8]	237	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Support	Supports submission 8/4	Allow submission 8/4
92	5	Bishop, Robert Alan	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
96	3	Russell, Ian	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
97	4	Hindrup, Ray	Appendices	Appendix 18c	Oppose	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
407	6	Nickolson, Dave	Definitions	Add	Oppose	A number of objectives and policies use the term 'inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. In the context of an outstanding landscape, how is 'inappropriate' defined.	Address submitter's concerns in s42A report.
450	6	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Definitions	Add	Oppose	A number of objectives and policies use the term 'inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. In the context of an outstanding landscape, how is 'inappropriate' defined.	Address submitter's concerns in s42A report.
492	6	Grierson, Monique	Definitions	Add	Oppose	A number of objectives and policies use the term 'inappropriate subdivision, use and development'. In the context of an outstanding landscape, how is 'inappropriate' defined.	Address submitter's concerns in s42A report.
498	2	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Definitions	Add	In Part	The plan should be consistent with Policy 15 of the NZCPS 2010 by including outstanding natural features.	Add a definition for Outstanding Natural Features. Wording provided in submission.
589[498]	19	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Definitions	Add	Support	Supports submission 498/2.	Accept submission 498/2.
255	1	Hogan, Jonathon Peter	Definitions	Amend	Oppose	Variation 1: 9.1 - 9.3 & 9.45 The above mentioned be decided by the community and ratepayers due to the legal, social, economic, cultural, ecological and geological impacts.	OLA and VAL be determined by ratepayers and the community.
589[255]	12	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Definitions	Amend	Support	Supports submission 255/1.	Accept submission 255/1.
378	41	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Definitions	Amend	In Part	Oppose in part the definition of 'environmental benefit'. It should cite Appendix 18B.	Amend the definition.
378	42	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Definitions	Amend	Support	Support inclusion of definition 'Outstanding Landscape Area' with amendment for clarity and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.
378	43	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Definitions	Amend	Support	Supports definition of 'Visual Amenity Landscape' with amendments for consistency and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	51	Hawley, Catherine and John	Definitions	Amend	In Part	Oppose in part the definition of 'environmental benefit'.	Amend the definition to recognise Appendix 18C.
397	52	Hawley, Catherine and John	Definitions	Amend	Support	Support inclusion of definition 'Outstanding Landscape Area' with amendment for clarity and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.
397	53	Hawley, Catherine and John	Definitions	Amend	Support	Supports definition of 'Visual Amenity Landscape' with amendments for consistency and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.
444	2	Elliott, Jan	Definitions	Amend	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 18B - Definition of OLA 18 Bream Tail Coast.	The submitter seeks that the name should be consistent in Appendix 18B and on Map 17 of 60, reading: 'Bream Tail Coast' in each case.
451	41	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Definitions	Amend	In Part	Oppose in part the definition of 'environmental benefit'. It should cite Appendix 18B.	Amend the definition.
451	42	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Definitions	Amend	Support	Support inclusion of definition 'Outstanding Landscape Area' with amendment for clarity and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.
451	43	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Definitions	Amend	Support	Supports definition of 'Visual Amenity Landscape' with amendments for consistency and accuracy.	Amend definition as proposed within the submission.
464	23	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Definitions	Amend	In Part	Definition of VALs in Chapter 9 is confusing and misleading.	Delete the last two sentences in definition 9.148.
463	2	Kaipara District Council :	Definitions	Delete	In Part	The submitter states that the last two sentences of Definition 9.148 - Visual Amenity Landscape explain process and do not contribute to the definition of the term.	Delete the following two sentences from Definition 9.148 - Visual Amenity Landscape: 'In the District Plan Outstanding landscape Areas are given the highest level of protection and are identified on the planning maps. Visual Amenity Landscapes are not mapped and there are no specific rules associated with them, however their location is indicated within Appendix G for information purposes.'
202	5	Taylor, Leslie James	Definitions	None	Oppose	Opposes the definition of OLA.	No decision sought.
283	53	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Definitions	None	Support	Definition 9.45 Environmental Benefit is supported as proposed.	Retain as proposed

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
200	2	Lindar Downs Limited : Drador, Kenneth :	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	Oppose	OLAs on private property, if for the benefit of the public, should be purchased to ensure they are protected.	Purchase privately owned land deemed OLAs.
262	1	Coates, Edward and Marjorie	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	Support	Support Chapter 18 and all significant features within OLAs.	Chapter 18 be included in the District Plan.
589[262]	60	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 262 in its entirety.	Reject submission 262 in its entirety.
378	35	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	In Part	The methods of Variation 1 are supported. However, Appendix 18B and the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report contain errors and need updating. Numerous references are also made in Chapter 12. It is essential that their contents are accurate, comprehensive and consistent. The submitter identifies particular OLAs and VALs that have not been revised or updated even though information sources are available.	Submitter requests that such revisions and updating be undertaken.
397	44	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	Support	Support the inclusion of all OLAs in Map Series One Land Use Legend (Sept 2010) and Part E Map Series One: Land Use Maps (Sept 2010).	No decision sought.
589[397]	2	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	Oppose	Opposes 397/44.	Reject 397/44.
451	35	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	General	In Part	The methodology of Variation is supported. However Appendix 18B and the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report contain errors and need updating. Numerous references are also made in Chapter 12. It is essential that their contents are accurate, comprehensive and consistent. The submitter identifies particular OLAs and VALs that have not been revised or updated even though information sources are available.	Submitter requests that such revisions and updating be undertaken.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[113]	43	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	None	N/A	Supports submission 113/2	Allow submission 113/2
145	1	Groupsky, Patrick	Extent and Quality of OLA	None	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA [Submitter states that it is OLA 28] and Appendix 18B. Map number [3] should be amended.
167	1	Burke, Julie	Extent and Quality of OLA	None	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA and Appendix 18B. Map number [270] should be amended.
180	1	Anae, Arthur John	Extent and Quality of OLA	None	N/A	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended.
231	1	Kelly, June	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 1 - Waipoua Forest	Oppose	Variation 1 OLA's should be applied to areas which require protection.	Remove OLA 1 from 182 Waima River Road.
463	15	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 1 - Waipoua Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 1 - Waipoua Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that a minor amendment is made to reduce OLA 1 to better reflect vegetation cover margin relative to pastoral land.
463	39	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 10 - Maungaraho	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 23 - Maungaraho needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 23 be amended to decrease the area to exclude contextual pasture, the boundaries should be amended to follow the line of the bush associated with the OLA.
411	1	Birt, Derek	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve.	The submitter seeks that their property is not included in OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve.
411	3	Birt, Derek	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve	Oppose	The submitter states that their property is generally not visible to the public, except from Bull Road which has low traffic volume.	Remove Lot 2 DP 200547 from OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve.
411	5	Birt, Derek	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve	Oppose	The submitter does not consider their land to be an outstanding landscape.	Remove Lot 2 DP 200547 from OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve
411	6	Birt, Derek	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve	Oppose	The submitter opposes planning controls being applied to their property.	Remove Lot 2 DP 200547 from OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve as well as removing any other 'landscape planning restrictions' from this property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
463	22	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 11 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 11 is amended to exclude pasture and better reflect the edge of the bush.
202	1	Taylor, Leslie James	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	The submitter opposes Area 183 being included in OLA 13B [OLA 14 - Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges]	The submitter seeks that Area 183 be excluded from OLA 13B [OLA 14]
439	10	Anderson, Innes McRae	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their land being included in OLA 13a.	The submitter seeks that their farmed land and riparian margin around their lake be excluded from OLA.
463	23	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 13 needs to be amended to exclude areas of pasture and gorse/regenerating shrubland at western extreme of feature.
575[463]	1	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/23.	Submission 463/23 be disallowed.
576[463]	1	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/23	disallow submission 463/23 in part
463	24	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - - Marerehu Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 13 needs a slight amendment to decrease the extent of the OLA in vicinity of Jude Road due to a mapping error.
575[463]	2	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/24.	Submission 463/24 be disallowed.
463	25	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 13 is amended to decrease the extent of the OLA in the vicinity of Wonderview Road to exclude exotic vegetation and more accurately follow the edge of native vegetation.
575[463]	3	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/25.	Submission 463/25 be disallowed.
576[463]	2	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/25	Disallow submission 463/25 in part

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
576[463]	3	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/25 in part	Disallow submission 463/25 in part
463	26	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 13 is amended to decrease the extent and better follow the edge of bush, excluding the water source and margins of a constructed dam.
575[463]	4	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/26.	Submission 463/26 be disallowed in part.
576[463]	4	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/26 in part	Disallow submission 463/26 in part
463	27	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that minor amendments are made to OLA 13 to decrease the extent of the area in the vicinity of Tara Road to more closely follow the property boundary.
575[463]	5	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/27.	Submission 463/27 be disallowed.
576[463]	5	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/27 in part	Disallow submission 463/27 in part
463	28	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that the extent of OLA 13 is decreased to north of King/Kapawiti Road to exclude pasture and better reflect the edge of the bush.
575[463]	6	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/28.	Submission 463/28 be disallowed.
576[463]	6	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Opposes submission 463/28 in part	opposes submission 463/28 in part

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
482	1	Gash, Mark William	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 13.	Amend the boundary of OLA 13 Appendix 18B, no Map number specific.
543	1	Hislop, Alexandra	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised further to our voluntary covenanting of bush on our farm. We would like the area recognised under the proposed KDC Plan Variation 1.	Amend the boundary of OLA 13. No map number specified.
63	1	Cullen, Stephen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	In Part	Supports in part Map Series 1, OLA and Appendix 18B. OLA 13 should be subject to amendments.	Appendix 18B and the boundary of OLA 13 to be amended as discussed with Council's Landscape Architect
70	1	Smith, Edward John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges.	Seeks that their property (numbers 168 and 222 on Landscape Areas - 2006 Study - OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges) is not included in OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges and that farming is made a permitted activity by council. Map provided in submission.
576[70]	15	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/1	Disallow submission 70/1
71	1	Cullen, Bruce Trevor	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 13 - Marerehu Forest	Oppose	The extent of OLA 13 needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 13 and Appendix 18B. Map number 13 should be amended to exclude DP 61490 - NA19A/322 (Boarhill).
110	9	Hogan, Jonathon	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	N/A	The extent of OLA 14 - Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 14 - Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended.
110	10	Hogan, Jonathon	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in OLA 14 and they met with Simon Cocker, Council Landscape architect who said their property did not need to be included.	The submitter requests that their property is removed from OLA 14 as they were informed.
134	1	Palmer Shanahan, Margaret, Brain, Kate and Jeremy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	In Part	The submitter partially supports OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges [OLA 14] with proposed amendments.	The submitter seeks that the boundaries of OLA 14 are altered to include their property at 48B Jude Road (map provided by submitter).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
202	2	Taylor, Leslie James	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	The submitter opposes OLA 14.	The submitter seeks that OLA 14 be resurveyed to ensure it is actually an outstanding landscape
575[202]	18	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 202/2.	Submission 202/2 be disallowed.
576[202]	18	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 202/2	Disallow submission 202/2
333	1	Henry, Richard	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	The submitter states that they support Jim Taylors submission, that opposed OLA 14 - Bream Tail-Brynderwyn Ranges	No decision sought
397	46	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Oppose the definition of the OLA 14 boundary as it applies on the southern slopes of the Brynderwyn Hills.	Revisit the extent of this boundary and extend the OLA to follow the toe of the feature.
463	29	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 14 - Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 14 is amended to exclude exotic vegetation and to better reflect the edge of the bush.
484	9	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Support	Area identified as OLA 14 is of special significance and should be protected as an OLA.	No decision sought
484	10	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	In Part	To ensure a consistent approach to development is taken, the boundary at the north eastern end of OLA 14 should be extended to connect with OLA 18 unless this total area is included within the boundary of VAL 35.	That the north eastern boundary of OLA 14 be extended to connect to OLA 18 Bream Tail Coast unless the total area between the two OLAs is completely covered by VAL 35.
523	5	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	N/A	The Brynderwyn Ranges are significant.	Extend OLA 18 over the Brynderwyn Range [KDC identify this as OLA 14] to comprise the whole ridge east to west including the foothills e.g. the back of Kapawiti Road, along Pebblebrook and Brown roads.
575[529]	20	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 529/1.	Submission 529/1 be disallowed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
575[70]	15	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/1.	Submission 70/1 be disallowed.
70	3	Smith, Edward John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges [OLA 14].	The submitter seeks that their property is removed from OLA 13a Bream Tail - Brynderwyn Ranges [OLA 14]. The submitter also seeks 8 specific activities (including aquaculture land based, accommodation)to be permitted and 4 specific activities to be discretionary (including commercial and residential)[refer to submission for specific activities].
575[70]	17	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/3.	Submission 70/3 be disallowed.
576[70]	17	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/3	Disallow submission 70/3
90	1	Curreen, Helen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 14 - Bream Tail /	Support	OLA 14 be enlarged to protect from future development.	Enlarge OLA 14 (no map provided).
100	2	Ballard, Helen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[100]	228	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 100/2	Allow submission 100/2
101	2	Robinson, Raelene	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[101]	73	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 101/2	Allow submission 101/2
102	2	Hacker, Shaun	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[102]	269	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 102/2	Allow submission 102/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
103	2	Cooper-Davies, Peter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[103]	90	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 103/2	Allow submission 103/2
104	2	Heggie, Alastair	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[104]	117	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 104/2	Allow submission 104/2
105	2	Laker, Colin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[105]	34	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 105/2	Allow submission 105/2
106	2	Seddon, David	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[106]	111	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 106/2	Allow submission 106/2
108	2	Hodges, Richard Donald	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[108]	180	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 108/2	Allow submission 108/2
109	2	Kerrigan, Graham	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[109]	188	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 109/2	Allow submission 109/2
111	2	Michael, Joe	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[111]	96	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 111/2	Allow submission 111/2
112	2	Allan, David	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[112]	222	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 112/2	Allow submission 112/2
113	2	Miller, Todd	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
114	2	Cooke, David	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[114]	160	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 114/2	Allow submission 114/2
115	2	Ovesen, Vicki	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[115]	38	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 115/2	Allow submission 115/2
116	2	Smith, Georgie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[116]	175	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 116/2	Allow submission 116/2
117	2	Van Rooyen, Steph	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[117]	257	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 117/2	Allow submission 117/2
120	2	Sommerville, Carolyn Louise	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[120]	212	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 120/2	Allow submission 120/2
121	2	Torr, Anna	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[121]	109	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 121/2	Allow submission 121/1
122	2	Torr, Craig	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[122]	2	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Supports submission 122/2	Allow submission 122/2
127	2	Reddy, Adrian	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[127]	18	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 127/2	Allow submission 127/2
129	2	Underwood, Rayma	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[129]	127	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 129/2	Allow submission 129/2
130	2	Underwood, E C	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[130]	131	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 130/2	Allow submission 130/2
131	2	Wattam, Eleanor Jean	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[131]	53	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 131/2	Allow submission 131/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
132	2	Wilson, Peter and Liliam	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[132]	283	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 132/2	Allow submission 132/2
133	2	Wattan, Stan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[133]	51	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 133/2	Allow submission 133/2
135	2	Christie, Nellie Maude	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[135]	301	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 135/2	Allow submission 135/2
136	2	Kehely, Trevor	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[136]	306	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 136/2	Allow submission 136/2
138	1	Robinson, Paula	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports the Baldrock Area.	Not stated.
604[138]	76	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Opposes submission 138/1	Disallow submission 138/1
139	1	Pukepohatu Association : Robinson, Paula :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports Baldrock Area 61	Accept Variation 1, Baldrock Area 61
604[139]	219	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes submission 139/1	Disallow submission 139/1
139	2	Pukepohatu Association : Robinson, Paula :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Baldrock Area 63 does not cover the southern boundary of the section.	Extend Baldrock Area 63 to include the native bush at the southern edge.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[139]	220	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes submission 139/2	Disallow submission 139/2
140	2	Hosking, Estelle	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[140]	182	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 140/2	Allow submission 140/2
155	2	Davey, Deborah	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[155]	32	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 155/2	Allow submission 155/2
157	2	Furze, Peter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[157]	204	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 157/2	Allow submission 157/2
158	2	Keay, D G	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[158]	99	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 158/2	Allow submission 158/2
159	2	Hales, Des	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[159]	45	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 159/2	Allow submission 159/2
160	2	Hales, Renee	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[160]	277	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 160/2	Allow submission 160/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
161	2	Keay, Jocelyn	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[161]	194	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 161/2	Allow submission 161/2
163	2	Hales, G and J	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[163]	285	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 163/2	Allow submission 163/2
164	2	Clarry, Kevin George	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[164]	317	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 164/2	Allow submission 164/2
165	2	Furze, Merrill	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[165]	218	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 165/2	Allow submission 165/2
168	2	Watson, Michael Alexander Claude	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[168]	198	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 168/2	Allow submission 168/2
18	2	Chambers, Delwyn	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[18]	289	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 18/2	Allow submission 18/2
187	2	Ward, Natalie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[187]	123	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 187/2	Allow submission 187/2
19	2	Leaf, Julia	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[19]	291	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 19/2	Allow submission 19/2
196	2	O'Connor, Helen Beatrice	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[196]	308	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 196/2	Allow submission 196/2
197	2	O'Connor, Alwyn	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[197]	192	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 197/2	Allow submission 197/2
204	2	Musgrave, Brigette	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[204]	295	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 204/2	Allow submission 204/2
205	2	Paton, Barry	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[205]	311	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 205/2	Allow submission 205/2
206	2	Rogers, Roy John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[206]	156	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 206/2	Allow submission 206/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
207	2	Paton, A H	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[207]	162	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 207/2	Allow submission 207/2
208	2	Rodgers, Neil and Sarah	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[208]	158	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 208/2	Allow submission 208/2
209	2	Underwood, Steven E	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[209]	293	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 209/2	Allow submission 209/2
210	2	Underwood, Francesca	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[210]	113	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 210/2	Allow submission 210/2
211	2	Willcox, Peter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[211]	86	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 211/2	Allow submission 211/2
21	2	Morris, Kay	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[21]	287	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 21/2	Allow submission 21/2
212	2	Willcox, Rita	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[212]	75	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 212/2	Allow submission 212/2
213	2	Donaldson, Craig	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[213]	214	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 213/2	Allow submission 213/2
214	2	Whitburn, Robyn	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[214]	173	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 214/2	Allow submission 214/2
215	2	Aislabie, Jessica	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[215]	40	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 215/2	Allow submission 215/2
216	2	Parker, Scott	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[216]	84	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 216 in its entirety.	Accept submission 216 in its entirety.
217	2	Underwood, P R	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[217]	202	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 217/2	Allow submission 217/2
218	2	Brown, Brenda	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[218]	133	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 218/2	Allow submission 218/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
219	2	de Graaf, Adrianus	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[219]	304	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 219/2	Allow submission 219/2
220	2	de Graaf, Josina	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[220]	186	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 220/2	Allow submission 220/2
221	2	Underwood, Karla	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[221]	154	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 221/2	Allow submission 221/2
222	2	Loftus, Beverly	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[222]	299	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 222/2	Allow submission 222/2
223	2	Howse, Catarina	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[223]	314	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 223/2	Allow submission 223/2
224	2	Howse, Bryan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[224]	249	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 224/2	Allow submission 224/2
225	2	Howse, Stephanie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[225]	297	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 225/2	Allow submission 225/2
226	2	Waelford, Dezarae	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[226]	206	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 226/2	Allow submission 226/2
227	2	Underwood, Troy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[227]	261	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 227/2	Allow submission 227/2
23	2	Coates Foote, Beatrice	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[23]	61	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 23/2	Allow submission 23/2
24	2	Harfoot, Cynthia	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[24]	55	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 24/2	Allow submission 24/2
250	2	Rogers, Nona	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[250]	143	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 250/2	Allow submission 250/2
252	2	Howell, Michael	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[252]	190	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 252/2	Allow submission 252/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
260	2	Hastie, Deborah	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	The submitter supports OLA 15 - Pukepohatu Q08 4063 Sheet 22	The submitter seeks that the features are listed but that the new restrictions should not be added. Instead, applications should be decided on their own merit.
604[260]	233	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes submission 260/2	Disallow submission 260/2
261	1	Reddy, Adrian and Elaine	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	N/A	OLA 15 be reduced in size so as to exclude dwelling [referred to specifically as Landscape Area 65]	Amend OLA boundary as indicated on submission. (Map provided in submission)
604[261]	97	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	In Part	Opposes in part submission 261/1	Disallow in part submission 261/1
26	2	Harfoot, Christopher	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[26]	259	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 26/2	Allow submission 26/2
31	1	Pilbrow, Elizabeth Coates	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Baldrock is tapu to Maori - contains carvings and skeletons. Locality also holds Kauri, unique frogs and snails.	Retain Baldrock on the OLA list. The naming of Brynderwyn Ranges should be Pilbrow Hill.
604[31]	178	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes submission 31/1	Disallow submission 31/1
32	2	Stratford, G.	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[32]	177	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 32/2	Allow submission 32/2
33	2	O'Conner, Erin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[33]	139	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 33/2	Allow submission 33/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
334	2	Harfoot, Tracey Ellice	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[334]	265	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 334/2	Allow submission 334/2
34	2	Dick, Fiona	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[34]	267	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 34/2	Allow submission 34/2
35	2	Dick, Laura	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[35]	271	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 35/2	Allow submission 35/2
360	2	O'Sullivan, Paul	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[360]	26	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 360/2	Allow submission 360/2
36	2	Dick, Alison	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[36]	69	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 36/2	Allow submission 36/2
37	2	Dick, Anna	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[37]	247	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 37/2	Allow submission 37/2
38	2	Dick, Phillip	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[38]	57	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 38/2	Allow submission 38/2
39	2	Young, Jennifer Margaret	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[39]	63	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 39/2	Allow submission 39/2
400	2	Underwood, Christine	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[400]	230	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 400/2	Allow submission 400/2
604[40]	224	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 40/2	Allow submission 40/2
40	4	Rogers, Eileen Valarie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
410	2	Lau, Diana	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[410]	16	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 410/2	Allow submission 410/2
413	2	Hardie-Neil, D J	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[413]	253	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 413/2	Allow submission 413/2
417	2	Underwood, Dwayne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[417]	226	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 417/2	Allow submission 417/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
420	2	O'Sullivan, Emma	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[420]	125	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 420/2	Allow submission 420/2
421	2	Underwood, Emily	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[421]	167	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 421/2	Allow submission 421/2
43	2	Gunnery, Lisa	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[43]	165	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 43/2	Allow submission 43/2
434	2	O'Connor, Huw	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[434]	49	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 434/2	Allow submission 434/2
435	2	Underwood, Harley	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[435]	88	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 435/2	Allow submission 435/2
437	2	Fletcher, Ian	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[437]	105	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 437/2	Allow submission 437/2
44	2	Hardie Neil, Jonathan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[44]	169	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Support submission 44/2	Allow submission 44/2
45	2	Hardie Neil, Alistair	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[45]	103	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 45/2	Allow submission 45/2
46	2	Neil, Sue	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[46]	65	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 46/2	Allow submission 46/2
473	2	Harfoot, Kieran Gibbs	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[473]	6	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 473/2	Allow submission 473/2
47	2	Hardie Neil, Anna	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[47]	279	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 47/2	Allow submission 47/2
484	12	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports OLA 15 as proposed.	Endorses OLA 15 as proposed.
604[484]	41	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes submission 484/12	Disallow submission 484/12
48	2	Hardie Neil, David	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[48]	208	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 48/2	Allow submission 48/2
49	2	Hardie Neil, Timothy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[49]	115	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 49/2	Allow submission 49/2
50	2	Hardie Neil, Jenneane	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[50]	210	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 50/2	Allow submission 50/2
509	1	Dropulich, Tania Jane	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	The extent of the OLA [identified as OLA 18] need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included at Baldrock, Kaiwaka.	Amend the boundary of OLA [identified as OLA 18] in Appendix 18B. Map number not specified. Or revoke the proposed district plan and amend the operative plan.
604[509]	315	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 509/1	Allow submission 509/1
51	2	Hardie Neil, Bruce John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
602[51]	14	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 51/2	Allow submission 51/2
604[51]	273	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 51/2	Allow submission 51/2
524	2	Fletcher, Yvonne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[524]	148	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 524/2	Allow submission 524/2
52	2	Kay, Fay	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[52]	22	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 52/2	Allow submission 52/2
531	2	Causer, Gary C	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[531]	121	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 531/2	Allow submission 531/2
534	2	Neale, Richard	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[534]	4	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 534/2	Allow submission 534/2
53	2	Paterson, Scott	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[53]	94	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 53/2	Allow submission 53/2
535	2	Drake, Rachel Lucy Caughey	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[535]	24	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 535/2	Allow submission 535/2
536	2	Drake, Libby	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[536]	152	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 536/2	Allow submission 536/2
537	2	Drake, Bridget Elizabeth Caughey	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[537]	281	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 537/2	Allow submission 537/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
544	2	Gledhill, Charles	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[544]	71	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 544/2	Allow submission 544/2
54	2	Paterson, Varina	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[54]	150	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 54/2	Allow submission 54/2
545	2	Causer, Lynne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[545]	251	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 545/2	Allow submission 545/2
546	2	Latimer, Barry Thomas	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[546]	82	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 546/2	Allow submission 546/2
547	2	Schultz, Ralph Fredrick	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[547]	196	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 547/2	Allow submission 547/2
548	2	Sands, Phill	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[548]	14	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 548/2	Allow submission 548/2
549	2	Schultz, Jennie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[549]	184	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 549/2	Allow submission 549/2
550	2	Schultz, Ben	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[550]	30	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 550/2	Allow submission 550/2
551	2	Schultz, L A	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[551]	10	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 551/2	Allow submission 551/2
55	2	Paterson, Ken	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[55]	141	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 55/2	Allow submission 55/2
56	2	Paterson, Carol Lynne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[56]	135	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 56/2	Allow submission 56/2
57	2	Paterson, Cam	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[57]	255	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 57/2	Allow submission 57/2
62	2	Coates, Arthur Eric	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[62]	80	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 62/2	Allow submission 62/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
64	2	Sommerville, Marcus	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[64]	101	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 64/2	Allow submission 64/2
65	2	Caughy, Lucy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[65]	59	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 65/2	Allow submission 65/2
72	2	Tawharu, Anna	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[72]	78	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 72/2	Allow submission 72/2
73	2	Millar, Jessie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[73]	20	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 73/2	Allow submission 73/2
74	2	Dyer, Murray	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[74]	92	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Supports submission 74/2	Allow submission 74/2
75	2	Salvigny, Gary	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[75]	137	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 75/2	Allow submission 75/2
76	2	Evelyn Salvigny :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[76]	275	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 76/2	Allow submission 76/2
77	2	Rimmer, Bernie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[77]	232	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 77/2	Allow submission 77/2
78	2	Rimmer, Glennis	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[78]	47	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 78/2	Allow submission 78/2
79	2	Cooper, Wendy L.	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[79]	12	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 79/2	Allow submission 79/2
80	2	Young, Rebecca Diana	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[80]	263	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 80/2	Allow submission 80/2
82	2	Salvigny, Brian	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[82]	36	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 82/2	Allow submission 82/2
83	2	Beach Caughey, Elizabeth	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[83]	171	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 83/2	Allow submission 83/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
84	2	Caughey, David E.	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[84]	119	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 84/2	Allow submission 84/2
85	2	McQuinlan, Katrina	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[85]	8	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Supports submission 85/2	Allow submission 85/2
86	2	McConell, Judith Mary	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[86]	28	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 86/2	Allow submission 86/2
87	2	McConell, Alfred William	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[87]	216	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 87/2	Allow submission 87/2
8	11	Underwood, Kenneth	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[8]	244	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 8/11	Allow submission 8/11
8	12	Underwood, Kenneth	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	In Part	The extent of OLA 15 needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 15 and Appendix 18B. Map number [88] should be amended.
604[8]	245	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 8/12	Allow submission 8/12
88	2	Underwood, Kendon	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[88]	67	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 88/2	Allow submission 88/2
93	2	Mannix, Mike	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[93]	107	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 93/2	Allow submission 93/2
94	2	Mannix, Valerie	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[94]	129	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 94/2	Allow submission 94/2
95	2	Staff, Linda	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[95]	200	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 95/2	Allow submission 95/2
99	2	Ballard, Luke	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
604[99]	146	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Support	Supports submission 99/2	Allow submission 99/2
172	1	Greenway Estate : Hubert, George :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	In Part	The extent of OLA 16 - Pukearenga needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 16 - Pukearenga and Appendix 18B. Map number 53 should be amended.
41	2	Le Gallais, Leddra Martin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	In Part	A fence line on the boundary with the southern end of the Pukearengo OLA (Map 20 of 60) need be bulldozed to construct a better fence to keep cattle out of the OLA.	Carry out earthworks to build a fence on the boundary of the Pukearengo OLA.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
463	30	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 16 - - Pukearenga needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 16 is amended to exclude areas of pasture with scattered Totara located on the southern margin of the feature. The edge of the feature should be amended to accurately follow the forest margin.
484	13	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	Support	Supports OLA 16 as proposed.	Endorses OLA 16 as proposed.
91	1	Watt, Kevin Murray	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	Support	Notes there are numerous goats in the OLA 16 area.	A 'heavy cull' of the goats in OLA 16.
91	2	Watt, Kevin Murray	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	Support		Maori burial sites and middens be identified in the Pukearenga Bush to prevent damage.
91	3	Watt, Kevin Murray	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 16 - Pukearenga	Support	Has heard kiwis at night.	The area become a significant natural area (SNA).
1	3	Worsfold, Heath	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 17 - Pukekaroro	In Part	Supports in part the inclusion of OLA 17 as an OLA. The mountain is important to Maori, is an important landscape icons for Kaiwaka, has identified representative examples of Kauri Forest in New Zealand and is surrounded by two streams, one of which supplies the Kaipara town water supply.	Extend OLA area to the foothills of the mountain to avoid inappropriate development. All maps in entirety under Series 1 should encompass surrounding private land areas that form an imprint against the prominent landscapes to avoid adverse earthworks and built development.
260	1	Hastie, Deborah	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 17 - Pukekaroro	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of some of their property within OLA 17 - Pukekaroro.	The submitter seeks that the features are classified and listed but that the rules and regulations from the general rural policy should be kept as they are adequate to protect these features.
484	14	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 17 - Pukekaroro	Support	Supports OLA 17 as proposed.	Endorses OLA 17 as proposed.
371	5	Preston, Alan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	In Part	Support OLA 18, but needs to be enlarged.	Amend OLA 18 to include Te Uri o Hau pa sites at the headland and include the western side of the coastal ridge.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
405	1	Shearer, Craig	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	In Part	The submitter thinks the definition for OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast is too narrow.	The submitter seeks amendment to OLA 18 so that "this portion of coastline as viewed from the coastal marine area, to a distance of one kilometre, is included within the OLA. The definition of this unit should include all land from the sea/land interface to the highest point of the OLA."
444	3	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast.	The submitter seeks that the western boundary of OLA 18 should adjoin the eastern boundary of OLA 14 - Bream Tail-Brynderwyn Ranges.
444	4	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast.	The submitter seeks that the spelling of 'precititous' should be corrected to: 'precipitous' in paragraph one of the description.
484	15	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	In Part	Supports the area of OLA 18.	Extension of western boundary to include VAL 35.
512	1	The Bream Tail Residents Association : Davies, Evan :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	Oppose	Variation unnecessary. Protection of significant areas within OLA 18 already occurs.	Remove Bream Tail Rock Coast from Variation.
90	2	Curreen, Helen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast	Support	OLA 18 be enlarged to protect from future development.	Enlarge OLA 18 (no map provided).
397	45	Hawley, Catherine and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	Extent of OLA 19 needs amendment as they are inaccurately drawn and do not reflect the text in the Landscape Assessment Worksheet 2010.	Amend the boundary of OLA 19 as described within the submission (coastal ridge and reserve).
407	3	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	Oppose	The description of OLA 19: Sentinal Rock Coast largely relates to the coastal margins and beach areas which is considered a Regional Council function and not a District Council one.	No decision sought.
444	5	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast.	The submitter seeks that 'Sentinal' should be spelt as 'Sentinel'. Also, the name on Maps 17 and 53 of 60 needs to be changed from 'Sentinal Rock Sandy Coast' to 'Sentinel Rock Coast'.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
444	6	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast.	The submitter seeks that OLA 19 is endorsed with the addition of the pa sites at the headland and extension of the western boundaries of the OLA to include the western site of the coast ridge.
450	3	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	Oppose	The description of OLA 19: Sentinal Rock Coast largely relates to the coastal margins and beach areas which is considered a Regional Council function and not a District Council one.	No decision sought.
463	31	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 18 - Sentinal Rock Sandy Coast needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 18 needs to be extended within submitters properties where they agree and should follow a defined and recognisable edge that is visible in the landscape.
463	32	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that the southern boundary of OLA 18 is amended to include the coastal escarpment and within Bream Tail Farms the feature should be extended to include coastal pohutukawa (KDC Id. #82 and #85).
463	33	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 18 - Bream Tail Coast needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that within KDC Id. #86, the edge of the OLA should be amended to follow the escarpment edge and steep valley side.
484	18	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	In Part	Supports area of OLA 19 with the inclusion of Te Uri o Hau pa sites at the headland.	Endorses OLA 19 with the addition of Te Uri o Hau pa site at the headland and extension.
484	19	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	Support	Supports OLA 19 with the inclusion of areas on the western side of the ridge of the coastal area.	Endorses OLA 19 with an extension of its western boundary to include the coast ridge.
492	3	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	Oppose	The description of OLA 19: Sentinal Rock Coast largely relates to the coastal margins and beach areas which is considered a Regional Council function and not a District Council one.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
512	2	The Bream Tail Residents Association : Davies, Evan :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 19 - Sentinal Rock Coast	Oppose	Variation unnecessary. Protection of significant areas within OLA 19 already occurs.	Remove Sentinal Rock Coast from Variation.
12	1	Hewetson, Terry	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Supports the concept of OLAs but opposes the extent covering their property.	Refine the extent of OLA on property.
123	1	Grove, Peter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Rationale for OLA needs to be more clearly clarified.	Boundary of OLA 2 shown on Map 28 be amended to exclude all existing structures.
14	1	Hogan, Lewis	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Opposes inclusion of small freehold residential properties in OLAs, as is their property at 2 Aranga Beach Road.	All free hold small residential properties be excluded from the Variation 1 Plan for OLA 2.
14	2	Hogan, Lewis	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Opposes Map 28 of 60 - Land use: Arana Beach	Amend Map 28 of 60 - Land use: Arana Beach to exclude freehold residential properties.
14	4	Hogan, Lewis	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Agree with Mangawhai Bluff, lakes and Waipoua Forest as OLAs.	Not stated.
152	2	MacMillan, Alison	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLAs need to be revised pending clarification of why submitters property is in OLA 2.	Amend the boundary (Map Series 1, Map 28) to align with property boundaries in grey on the seaward side.
16	2	Neil, Robyn Patricia	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Opposes existing sections at Glinks Gully being included in OLA 2 as restricts landowners rights of use.	Exclude privately owned land at Glinks Gully from OLA and apply from the rear boundary of the section.
174	1	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach and Appendix 18B. Map number [8 of 14 of the 'Outstanding Area: West Coast Ocean Beach' Maps] Properties 067 and 069 should be removed from OLA 2.
178	1	Duder, David and Gay	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specific].

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
178	2	Duder, David and Gay	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The submitters property was initially included in Map Series 1, OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach but has since been removed. The submitter supports the exclusion of their section but is concerned it may be included again.	Seeks the boundaries for the proposed landscape be realigned off the residential sections at Maunganui Bluff.
179	1	Matheson, Noeline Ann	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach and Appendix 18B. Map Series One, Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended.
182	1	Toko, Francis George	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach needs to be revised pending clarification of why the submitters property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach and Appendix 18B. Map Series One Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended.
188	1	Coles, Peter and Rose	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Notes on assessment criteria.	Amend OLA 2 to exclude property.
235	10	Forrest, Logan James	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Pouto Dune Lakes within OLA 21A are already managed by Northland Regional Council.	Cooperation between KDC and Northland Regional Council required.
241	1	Stevens, Grant Richard	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included. The current designation of OLA on property includes areas of exotic forestry, pasture and needs to be specifically viewed on site with consideration of vegetation, contour and visual prominence from surrounding lands.	Halt passage of OLA and VAL designation over the property until consultation between landowner and council's landscape architect has occurred.
243	1	Nicoll, Geoffrey	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why property number 019 on map 11 of 14 West Coast Ocean Beach is included in OLA 2. Disagree with the minimal landform below the ridgeline justifying one third of the property being included in OLA.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 11 should be amended.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
243	2	Nicoll, Geoffrey	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Definition of OLA 2 boundary for Glinks Gully inconsistent and unfair with some cadastral parcels of Rarity/Visibility Landscape excluded.	Exclude "cadastral parcels" from OLAs and use inland boundary of each property.
244	1	Maude, Cynthia Joy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2 - Glinks Gully.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 Appendix 18B. Map number 11 should be amended.
244	2	Maude, Cynthia Joy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Definition of OLA 2 boundary for Glinks Gully inconsistent.	Amend OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Include land in cadastral parcels beyond 140 and 098 identified, include coastal cliff to the north and exclude OLA from such large portions of cadastral parcels 082, 019, 053, 026, 040, 089, 131, 141 and 098.
253	1	Guy, David and Bev	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	OLA boundaries are not sufficiently justified and too extensive.	Remove OLA 2 (West Coast Ocean Beach) from 1008 Te Maire Road.
258	1	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to OLA 2 - 'West Coast Ocean Beach' partially covering their property (Allot 205 Tatarariki Psh Blks IX XIII Tokatoka SD).	The submitter seeks that OLA 2 is removed from their property (Allot 205 Tatarariki Psh Blks IX XIII Tokatoka SD).
258	2	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	The submitter supports OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach being applied to the crown property (allot 205 Tatarariki Psh Blks IX XIII Tokatoka SD) identified as '021' on Map 10 of 14.	The submitter seeks that the entire section of '021' [shown on Map 10 of 14] is included in OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach
265	1	Fernandez, Blodwen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 41 should be amended.
27	1	Pryde, Gordon	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Opposes inclusion of residential properties at Baylys Beach in the proposed OLA.	Exclude all houses at Baylys Beach from OLAs.
567[27]	1	Pryde, William	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
568[27]	1	Grant, Ronald Hugh	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
572[27]	1	Hayes, Joanna	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
579[27]	1	Pryde, Sandra	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
581[27]	1	Little, Pamela	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
593[27]	1	Lee, Michael	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
605[27]	1	Blackmore, Ross	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 27/1.	Allow submission 27/1.
277	1	Kai Iwi Farms Ltd : Pevats, Mark :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2. Farmland has been included, a potential mapping anomaly.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 6 should be amended to align with the actual property boundary.
375	1	Morrison, Margaret	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Four residential houses have been included in the OLA at Baylys Beach.	Restrict the boundary of OLA 2 to the beach in the Baylys Beach Residential Area.
573[375]	2	Pryde, Arthur	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 375/1.	Allow submission 375/1.
587[375]	1	Morrison, David Max	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 375/1.	Allow submission 375/1.
591[375]	1	Morrison, Colin Glen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 375/1	Allow submission 375/1
593[375]	3	Lee, Michael	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 375/1.	Allow submission 375/1.
605[375]	3	Blackmore, Ross	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Support	Supports submission 375/1.	Allow submission 375/1.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
390	1	Heywood, Anne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The Outstanding Landscape Use Area specified in Variation 1, Map Series 1 [identified as OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach] does not qualify as outstanding and has not been justified.	Delete the Variation in entirety, or remove Baylys Beach from OLA 2, or remove settlement areas in identified gorges from OLA 2.
390	2	Heywood, Anne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	RMA and District Plan recognise and provide for the landscape value of the coast, including Baylys Beach. OLA 2 is unnecessary.	Delete the Variation in entirety, or remove Baylys Beach from OLA 2, or remove settlement areas in identified gorges from OLA 2.
401	1	Milich, Clem	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2. The property is pasture and grazed and is integral to farming operations. Parts of the property within the OLA are not distinct in land formation or vegetation to the remaining parts of the property.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 18 should be amended.
418	1	Wills, Edward	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of OLA 2 needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 13 should be amended.
419	1	Konings, Ethel	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Submitter supports in part Map 11 of 14 and Appendix 18B, specifically Glinks Gully.	The submitter seeks that private property not be included in OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach, specifically, Glinks Gully.
463	16	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The submitter states that amendments need to be made to OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach.	The submitter seeks that the OLA is reduced in Awana, Glinks, Baylys and Mahuta water supply basin baches to correct anomalies. Also reduce the inland extent of OLA 2.
472	1	Sowter, Kevin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Private Property should not be included in OLA 2, at Glinks Gully.	Exclude OLA from private property at Glinks Gully
480	1	Bracey, Mark Stanley	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2. The boundaries of OLA 2 extend into productive farmland.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 Appendix 18B. Map number 9 should be amended.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	23	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	N/A	Submitter has concerns with spatial extent of OLA 2 identified in Map Series 1 and Appendix 18B of the Plan. Submitter seeks to ensure that all areas mapped as OLA 2 exhibit qualities and values that contribute to the OLA status.	Any areas that do not exhibit these qualities and values should be removed from the OLA 2 area. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
494	4	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	Opposes the boundaries of OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach in regard to the Glinks Gully area.	Amend the OLA 2 boundary as detailed within the submission in the vicinity of Glinks Gully (reducing off private property but include unallocated Crown Land).
508	1	Theobald, Stephen John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA 2 need to be revised.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number not specified.
508	3	Theobald, Stephen John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	Reserve land at south of Marine Drive, Te Kopuru need be included in OLA 2.	Extend OLA 2 to include the reserve at Marine Drive, Te Kopuru. Map 11 of 14 should be amended.
526	1	Goulding, Timothy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 2.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number 12 of 14 at property 152 should be amended.
526	2	Goulding, Timothy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	N/A	OLA and VAL notation is unnecessary and costly. Landowners have a vested interest in preserving cliff features, Council imposes necessary control over development in these areas and their identification is flawed.	Exclude OLA and VAL notation from the property. Amend OLA 2 to comprise a narrower strip of land on Map 12.
66	1	Chases Gorge Camp Club : Jones, Graham :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The OLA boundary lines do not align with property boundaries.	Re-align OLA boundaries to match property boundaries.
69	1	Osbaldiston, Lynette Ann	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 2 and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified]. Glinks Gully.
371	6	Preston, Alan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit	In Part	Support OLA 20 but questions the D rating for Cultural Associations in the Kaipara District Landscape Assessment Worksheet; Spit contains midden fields and is a rare breeding place for the endangered NZ Fairy Tern.	Amend Landscape Assessment Worksheet of OLA 20 and description in Appendix 18B if appropriate.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
444	7	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit.	The submitter seeks that it the Spit as a breeding place for endangered NZ Fairy Tern should be notated in the Experiential Values assessment of the site and if appropriate the OLA description.
463	34	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 19 - Mangawhai Spit needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 19 is amended to better reflect the existing edge of the dune feature.
484	22	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit	In Part	Supports the area identified as OLA 20.	Endorses the area of OLA 20
238	1	Light House Lodge : Budgen, Roy :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 21 - Te Kopua Point	Oppose	Require revision of OLA 21 pending clarification of its boundary.	Amend OLA 21, Map 22.
463	35	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 21 - Te Kopua Point	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 20 - Te Kopua Point Headland and Harbour Edge needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 20 is decreased to remove the area along the harbour edge at the south western end of the feature.
92	1	Bishop, Robert Alan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 21 - Te Kopua Point	Oppose	Assessment criteria be clarified and justified.	OLA 21 boundary be amended.
144	1	Crown Forestry, MAF : Foran, Warwick :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included [The submitter refers to OLA 229]. OLA 22a should not include the submitters pine forest to the west of Lake Mokeno.	Revise OLA [22a] and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified] to specifically exclude existing planted production forest within the Pouto 2F Block (map provided by submitter).
602[144]	6	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Support	Supports submission 144/1	Allow submission 144/1
144	2	Crown Forestry, MAF : Foran, Warwick :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the area of foredune and the existing planted forest boundary in OLA 22a.	The submitter requests that the approximately 100 hectare area described above be removed from OLA 22a.
403	1	Taurua, Colin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	OLA 22 interferes with kaitiaki role and mana. Submitter's land Waingata, always been Maori owned. Co-management of Dune Lakes with NIWA and DoC show commitment to protecting their environment.	Boundary of OLA 22 should be excluded from the Variation.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
403	2	Taurua, Colin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	OLA 22 is marginal, visible only to the residents and a neighbour and serves no purpose in being included.	Boundary of OLA should be excluded 22 from the Variation.
463	36	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	In Part	The submitter seeks that OLA 21 - North Head Dune Lakes is amended.	The submitter seeks that the area of OLA 21 is reduced on flats and adjacent knolls that are closely related to but distinct from the core characteristics of the dune lakes themselves.
602[463]	7	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Support	Supports submission 463/36	Allow submission 463/36
463	37	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 21 - North Head Dune Lakes needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 21 is amended to remove OLA cover from 2 low lying depressions that appear as water bodies on the aged aerial base, but are now dry hollows with pastoral cover and remove isolated small lake with highly modified context and very limited natural character in its riparian margins.
602[463]	8	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Support	Supports submission 463/37	Allow submission 463/37
486	21	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	N/A	Submitter notes concern over the degree to which OLA 22 will be maintained in the future when the harvesting of plantation forestry occurs. It is considered more appropriate that this is a VAL rather than an OLA.	OLA 22 be deleted from Series 1 - District Plan Maps and Appendix 18B and replaced as a VAL in Appendix G and Appendix 18B. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
520	1	Green, Vivian	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 22.	Amend the boundary of OLA 22 and Appendix 18B. Map number 25 should be amended.
520	2	Green, Vivian	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 22 - North Head Dune Lakes	Oppose	The extent of OLA 22 between Lake Roto Otuauro and Lake Humahuma needs to be revised as the area between these lakes is not outstanding and is below the site of a proposed wind farm. Council and DoC treat the lakes as individual systems.	Remove OLA 22 identification from the area between Lake Roto Otuaruru and Lake Humahuma and amend Appendix 18B.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
234	1	Robinson, Harold and Raewyn	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 23 - North Head Coast & Western Dune Lakes	Oppose	Revise OLA pending clarification of why OLA 23 includes properties numbered 511, 524, 525 and 526.	Amend boundary of OLA 23, Map 14, to remove properties 511, 524, 525 and 526 [refer map attached to submission]
463	38	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 23 - North Head Coast & Western Dune Lakes	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 22 - North Head Coast and Western Dune Lakes needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 22 is amended to fit the eastern boundary more accurately around the production forest and to isolate the two areas of pine plantation in the midst of the OLA and near Lake Mokeno.
602[463]	9	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 23 - North Head Coast & Western Dune Lakes	Support	Supports submission 463/38	Allow submission 463/38
486	22	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 23 - North Head Coast & Western Dune Lakes	N/A	Submitter has concerns with spatial extent of OLA 23 identified in Map Series 1 and Appendix 18B of the Plan. Submitter seeks to ensure that all areas mapped as OLA 23 exhibit qualities and values that contribute to the OLA status.	Any areas that do not exhibit these qualities and values should be removed from the OLA area. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
495	1	Dassler, Neville James	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 23 - North Head Coast & Western Dune Lakes	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property numbered 527 is included in OLA 23.	Amend the boundary of OLA 23 and Appendix 18B. Map number 14 should be amended to exclude property number 527.
13	1	Ellis, Lance	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 3 - Tutamoe / Kaihu /	Oppose	Does not want proposed restrictions on properties 69 [identified as Sec 1 Blk x Tutamoe SD] and 76 [identified as Sec 6 Blk x Tutamoe SD].	Not stated
13	2	Ellis, Lance	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 3 - Tutamoe / Kaihu /	In Part	The extent of the OLA and values of the outstanding landscape need to be revised pending clarification of why the submitters property is included.	Amend Appendix 18B and the boundary of the OLA on Map 4 to exclude properties 69 and 76 [shown on Landscape Areas - 2006 Study - OLA 3a].
148	1	Property Applications NZ Ltd : Rutherford, Victor :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 3 - Tutamoe / Kaihu /	Oppose	OLA 3 impacts on private property rights.	Remove OLA 3 from Foster Road.
148	2	Property Applications NZ Ltd : Rutherford, Victor :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 3 - Tutamoe / Kaihu /	Oppose	Others should clean up his land he is sick of it.	No-one should come to Tutamoe.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
463	17	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 3 - Tutamoe / Kaihu /	In Part	The submitter states that amendments need to be made to OLA 3 - Tutamohe/Kaihu/Marlborough Forest.	The submitter seeks that the western boundary is altered to remove a pastoral spur adjoining indigenous forest as well as realigning the margin near Opouteke Road to remove the area of grass and regenerating indigenous growth.
181	1	James, John Ivor	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	Oppose	The extent of OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff needs to be revised pending clarification of why the submitters property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified] in the vicinity of Maunganui Bluff should be amended.
183	1	Bracey, Robin and Glenys	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	Oppose	The extent of OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff needs to be revised pending clarification of why the submitters property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff and Appendix 18B. Map Series One Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended.
189	1	Downey, Dennis and Kerry	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff. The OLA should be restricted to the Bluff Reserve and exclude private property, which is not outstanding.	Amend OLA 4 and Appendix 18B to exclude private property. Map number 3160 [unidentified] should be amended.
42	1	Vitasovich, Angela	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	In Part	Supports the protection of Maunganui Bluff Reserve but not the extent of the OLA boundary.	Refine extent of OLA.
463	18	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 4 - Manganui Bluff needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that the small areas of OLA 4 over DoC areas need to be amended to ensure they do not spill onto adjacent pastoral land.
68	1	Fisher, Claire	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 4 - Maunganui Bluff	Oppose	The extent of OLA 4 needs to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA 4 and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specific in italics]. Property valuation number 00990-02300.
463	19	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 5 - Trounson Kauri Park	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 5 - Trounson Kauri Park needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 5 is amended to remove two small areas of farmland, one concealed below a fringe of riparian trees and the other resulting from a mismatch between the aerial mapping base and the cadastre.
61	1	Nelson, Peter and Ketch	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 5 - Trounson Kauri Park	Oppose	The boundary line of OLA 5 goes through their property.	Revise the boundary line of OLA5 to follow the river instead of going through their property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
277	2	Kai Iwi Farms Ltd : Pevats, Mark :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 6 - Kai Iwi Lakes	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 6. Farmland has been included, a potential mapping anomaly.	Amend the boundary of OLA 6 and Appendix 18B. Map number 6 should be amended to align with the property boundary.
463	20	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 6 - Kai Iwi Lakes	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 6 - Kai Iwi Lakes needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that the farmland at the northwest end of Lake Waikare and a small adjustment to reduce the extent on a nearby flank to better fit with the apex of that flank.
486	20	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 6 - Kai Iwi Lakes	N/A	It is noted that OLA 6 has recently been subject to harvesting around the lakes, meaning that it is now a highly modified environment.	OLA 6 be deleted from Series 1 - District Plan Maps and Appendix 18B. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
409	2	Thomson, David Ronald	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 7 - Mangatipa	Oppose	Submitter opposes ID number 32 [OLA 7]	Submitter seeks that ID number 32 [OLA 7] is removed
154	1	Taylor, Joan Eva	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 8 - Maungaru Range	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included	Amend the boundary of the OLA. Map number 8 should be amended.
185	1	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 9 - Tangihua Range	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in OLA 9 - Tangihua Range.	Amend the boundary of OLA 9 - Tangihua Range and Appendix 18B. Map number 8 should be amended.
457	1	Simpkin, Jonathan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 9 - Tangihua Range	N/A	The submitter opposes grass and scrub areas being included as part of OLA 9 - Tangihua Range (refer to diagram on submission for exact location)	The submitter seeks that only DoC land be protected by OLA's
463	21	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLA 9 - Tangihua Range	In Part	The submitter states that OLA 9 - Tangihua Range needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that OLA 9 is decreased in extent at the western end of the feature, on the southern flank. This amends the edge of OLA 9 to follow the edge of the forest.
1	1	Worsfold, Heath	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Supports the Chapter but it lacks identification of OLAs on private land as most identification is on DOC land and scenic reserves.	Assessment of other landscape areas needs to be on-going.
135	3	Christie, Nellie Maude	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Bald Rock should be retained buy owners reimbursed.	Reimburse owners for losses incurred by protection.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[135]	302	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 135/3	Allow submission 135/3
149	1	Bull, P	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of privately owned land in OLAs and VALs.	Exclude privately owned land from OLAs and VALs.
152	1	MacMillan, Alison	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLA are an unfair burden on private land owners.	1) Limit OLA areas to areas which only contain unchanged natural environments / landscapes.
177	1	Awhitu, Lucy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The extent of the OLA [unspecified] need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA [unspecified] and Appendix 18B. No map number specified.
177	2	Awhitu, Lucy	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land, including descendants.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
228	2	Flavell-Johnson, Alex	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	KDC has in the past had poor protection of outstanding landscapes from development. These developments have contravened the rules in the KDC DP and the provisions of the RMA.	Public decide / suggest on what are outstanding natural landscapes and features.
242	1	Buckthought, Ronald Graham	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Oppose subjective definition of 'outstanding landscape' on private property.	Exclude private property from OLAs. Remove all reference to VALs.
242	2	Buckthought, Ronald Graham	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLA on/near private property restricts land use.	Exclude private property from OLAs. Remove all reference to VALs.
249	3	Li Liangren Family Trust : Hood, Brett :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	N/A	Land planted for production forestry within OLAs subject to unreasonable rules/requirements (such as excavation and vegetation clearance) including visual amenity consideration for resource consents.	Restrict OLA 21 to the boundary of NA1182/48.
254	4	Greville, John Willis	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter states that the 'Greville' property is within an OLA but cannot be seen from anywhere.	The submitter seeks that the 'Greville' property is removed from the OLA that applies to it

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
266	1	Grieve, John Gibson	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Council duty to preserve outstanding landscapes. The extent and values of the OLAs need be revised.	Accept Appendix 18B and the boundary of these areas as OLAs. Council to continue to seek out landscapes for protection.
267	1	Grieve, Laura	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports the Variation. Council have a responsibility to preserve Outstanding Landscapes which they have failed to meet e.g. native forest clearance in Mangawhai. The extent of the OLA need to be increased.	Accept the OLAs and Appendix 18B. Council should seek out further Outstanding Landscapes to protect.
599[267]	1	Stuart, Helen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 267/1.	Allow submission 267/1.
269	1	Grieve, Justin Matthew	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Council duty to preserve outstanding landscapes, which has not been discharged. The extent and values of the OLAs need to be revised.	Accept Appendix 18B and the boundary of these areas as OLAs. Council to continue to seek out landscapes for protection.
270	1	Dawson, Elizabeth Jane	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Preserve natural heritage for future generations.	Accept the Variation.
272	1	Grieve, Shaye	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Council duty to preserve outstanding landscapes, which has not been discharged. The extent and values of the OLAs need be revised.	Accept Appendix 18B and the boundary of these areas as OLAs. Council to continue to seek out landscapes for protection.
283	109	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose		Restrict Visual Amenity Landscapes and Outstanding Landscape Areas to Council and Crown owned land only
286	2	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Management of private land should be left to landowners/farmers. Chapter 18 imposes an unfair and unreasonable burden on landowners.	Exclude private property from OLAs.
299	1	Combe Head Farms : Morshead, Pamela :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Private land should be managed by landowners.	Exclude all privately owned land from OLAs.
333	3	Henry, Richard	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in either an OLA or a VAL.	The submitter seeks that their property is not included in any VAL or OLA.
371	3	Preston, Alan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Western boundary of OLA 18 should adjoin eastern boundary of OLA 14, unless fully included in VAL35.	Extend OLA 18 to adjoin OLA 14.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
382	1	McCahon, Allister D and A Maree	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Outstanding Landscapes should include ridgelines.	Amend OLA 2 at 021, 050, 096 and 092 shown on Map Series One, Map Number 10 of 14 West Coast Ocean Beach to include the ridgelines of these areas.
602[382]	12	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Opposes submission 382/1	Disallow submission 382/1
387	9	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLAs identified do not deserve protection and are arbitrarily defined.	Not stated.
395	3	Calveley, C	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Lack of consultation with landowners led to poor identification of OLAs.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	34	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
395	4	Calveley, C	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Lack of detailed analysis of OLAs provided. Those OLAs identified are not outstanding in terms of 18.2 and 18.6.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	35	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	3	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Lack of consultation with landowners led to poor identification of OLAs.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	48	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
396	4	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Lack of detailed analysis of OLAs provided. Those OLAs identified are not outstanding in terms of 18.2 and 18.6.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	49	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
405	5	Shearer, Craig	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	The submitter supports Appendix 18C - Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes	The submitter requests that Appendix 18C - Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes be retained.
408	2	Sommerville, Monika and John	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports OLAs identified and encourage to protect.	No change.
41	1	Le Gallais, Leddra Martin	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Opposes 50m2 gross floor area limit for buildings in the OLA.	Provide for an 'average' sized house in the OLA.
415	1	Blaxall, Douglas	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes the OLA's.	The submitter requests that the OLA's be omitted from the plan.
423	1	Biddles, Elizabeth Anne	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included.	Amend the boundary of OLA and Appendix 18B. Map number [no Map number specified] should be amended (Baylys Beach).
578[423]	1	Woodhams, Louise	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Support.	Accept.
580[423]	1	Kidd, Penelope	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 423/1.	Allow submission 423/1.
582[423]	1	Mills, Stephen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 423/1.	Allow submission 423/1.
4	1	Biddles, Christopher	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Opposes OLA's implementation in the district plan.	Exclude OLAs from Chapter 18.
442	1	Forde, Jeanette	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and believes that no development should be allowed in them.	The submitter seeks that OLA's and VAL's be enlarged and additional area added in Mangawhai area.
599[442]	2	Stuart, Helen	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 442/1.	Allow submission 442/1.
444	14	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	The submitter supports in part OLA's.	The submitter seeks that strict conditions are applied to any development in OLA's, including (but not limited to): single level structures, restrictions on colour and reflectivity of building materials, visual compatibility with environment and surroundings, unobtrusive infrastructure such as power poles and access; driveways should not be visually inappropriate.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
447	1	Edwards, Graeme Robert	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter states that the definitions for OLA's and VAL's are too vague and should only apply to iconic landscapes	The submitter seeks that the OLA designations are reviewed to only include iconic features
447	2	Edwards, Graeme Robert	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to OLA's and VAL's significantly compromising private property rights for little public benefit, notably the Maungaru Range.	The submitter seeks that the boundaries of iconic features are reviewed to minimise the effect on private landowners. The submitter seeks that all VAL's are removed from private land.
463	13	Kaipara District Council :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	The submitter states that site visits with landowners mean alterations to OLA boundaries may need to occur.	The submitter seeks that amendments are made to OLA's, as described in Attachment 2.
602[463]	11	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 463/13	Allow submission 463/13
484	8	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports OLAs 1-13 as proposed.	Endorsement of OLAs 1-13 as drafted.
485	3	Chick, Melanie and Alden	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Use of privately owned land restricted and concern that dwelling could be removed if deemed unsightly.	Not stated.
489	4	Hayes, Michael Walter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Some OLAs identified are not outstanding e.g. are secondary regrowth on hillsides.	Physically view the landscapes to be protected. Overlays should be deleted from some of these landscapes.
489	6	Hayes, Michael Walter	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	A portion of OLAs are protected by DoC and Protection Belts. These areas will remain protected without the Variation.	Not stated.
500	2	Legarth, Olivia	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLA and VAL notations constrain normal farming activities.	Exclude all farmland from OLAs and VALs.
500	3	Legarth, Olivia	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLA and VAL notations place scenic qualities above economic use of the land.	Exclude all farmland from OLAs and VALs.
515	13	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes all OLA's and VAL's.	The submitter seeks that all references to VAL's are removed from the proposed district plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
517	1	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	The submitter supports the identification of OLA's and VAL's in Variation 1 - Landscapes but states that they need to be flexible in order to not prevent new lines being established in OLA's and VAL's if required.	The submitter seeks to retain VAL's and OLA's in Variation 1 - Landscapes but also provide and appropriate policy framework for the development of new lines in the event that they need to traverse such areas.
589[517]	76	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 517/1.	Accept submission 517/1.
602[517]	10	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 517/1	Allow submission 517/1
522	2	Vallancey, William	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	Parts of OLA and VAL already managed under DoC's plans/maps (1995).	Review OLA and VALs.
566[522]	2	Vallancey, William	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 522/2	Allow submission 522/2
523	3	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	In Part	OLAs identified are currently managed by DOC. Future proofing requires inclusion of subdivisions in OLAs.	Amend OLA 14 to include Heads subdivision (identified as a VAL), at least on ridgelines and seaward slopes and Bream Tail farm.
530	1	Adolph, Debra	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Private property should not be included in OLAs.	Not stated.
542	2	Jones, Charlotte	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	OLAs devalue land.	Delete rules in Variation that are based on aesthetics.
67	1	Investments, Poutu	Extent and Quality of OLA	OLAs in general	Oppose	Oppose Series 1 Map 18 p33 Appendix 18A OLA	Not stated.
124	1	Whitaker, Alan and Margaret	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Support in part map series 1, OLA and Appendix 18B but the OLA 14 need be revised pending clarification of why the submitters' property (Lot 1 DP 205675 and Lot 2 DP 315192) has been included in OLA 14.	Amend Appendix 18B and OLA 14 to exclude Lot 1 DP 205675 and Lot 2 DP 315192 so that OLA 14 follows the boundary of these parcels.
14	3	Hogan, Lewis	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Opposes their property (2 Aranga Beach Road) being part of the Outstanding Landscape Area.	Amend OLA to exclude submitter's property at 2 Aranga Beach Road.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
17	1	Alkel Constructors Limited : Miller, Emma :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	OLA imposed restrictions are onerous and unreasonable in relation to the activities which are carried out on the site. Restrictions of 12.10.1 and 12.10.2 are too onerous.	Remove the OLA from PT Section 48 Blk X Waipoua SD.
192	2	Foster, William Rowand	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The area marked 10 in OLA 11 [identified as Pt Lot 1 DP 23424 within OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve] is not fenced into the Pukekohe Reserve.	Restrict OLA 11 [OLA 12] to the Pukekohe Reserve, excluding the area marked 10.
198	1	Hare, Stephen	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Exotic forest species recently planted on property do not constitute the native bush remnant intended to be covered by OLA 16.	Exclude property from OLA 16 - Pukearenga.
200	1	Lindar Downs Limited : Drador, Kenneth :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Inclusion of submitter's land within OLA 2 will result in operational restrictions and consequential economic impact.	Exclude 994 Babylon Coast Road from OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach.
239	1	Russell, Keith Ernest	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included in area 92 [unidentified].	Amend the boundary of OLA 92 [unidentified] and Appendix 18B. Map number 10 should be amended.
249	1	Li Liangren Family Trust : Hood, Brett :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	OLA [identified as OLA 21] extends over NZ1182/48, land used for forestry requiring periodic harvesting.	Restrict OLA 21 to the boundary of NA 1182/48.
249	2	Li Liangren Family Trust : Hood, Brett :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	N/A	OLA [identified as OLA 21] extends over NZ1182/48, plantation forest land not outstanding/an iconic landform.	Restrict OLA 21 to the boundary of NZ1182/48.
249	4	Li Liangren Family Trust : Hood, Brett :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	N/A	Approved subdivision pending construction on NA1182/48 within OLA [identified as OLA 21].	Consider future environment when classifying landscapes as OLAs.
348	9	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	OLA includes two 40 hectare areas of plantation pine on the property. The landscape is not unique, Waipoua Forest or Marlborough Forest look identical.	Not stated.
359	1	Sharp, Richard	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Property does not adjoin Tokatoka Reserve or Montgomery Scenic Reserve.	Extend OLA 10 to property boundary as shown on the map provided.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
386	1	Pryde, Arthur	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Bayly's Beach Town Camps' four houses are surrounded by non-native vegetation planted for dune stabilisation. This does not constitute an outstanding nor original/existing natural landscape.	OLA 2 boundary be extended out to the boundary of the four residential properties of Bayly's Town Camp.
572[386]	2	Hayes, Joanna	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Support	Supports submission 386/1.	Allow submission 386/1.
581[386]	2	Little, Pamela	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Support	Supports submission 386/1.	Allow submission 386/1
593[386]	2	Lee, Michael	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Support	Supports submission 386/1.	Allow submission 386/1.
605[386]	2	Blackmore, Ross	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Support	Support submission 386/1.	Allow submission 386/1.
407	1	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of Chapter 18.	Remove the OLA from the property (Lot 2 DP 333700) and undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.
407	2	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The extent of the OLA on the submitter's property is unknown.	Identify the boundaries of the OLA on the submitter's property (preferably by survey) at no cost to the submitter.
407	5	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The description of the OLA states that 'the recent subdivision of the elevated land at the mouth of the harbour... has detracted significantly from this vegetated feature'. Does the submitter's property have capacity to absorb change (as noted in section 18.1).	Address the concerns of the submitter in the s42A report.
450	1	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of Chapter 18.	Remove OLA from the property (Lot 2 DP333700) and undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.
450	2	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The extent of the OLA on the submitters property is unknown.	Identify the boundaries of the OLA on the submitters property (preferably by survey) at no cost to the submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
450	5	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The description of the OLA states that 'the recent subdivision of the elevated land at the mouth of the harbour... has detracted significantly from this vegetated feature'. Does the submitter's property have capacity to absorb change (as noted in section 18.1).	Address the concerns of the submitter in the s42A report.
492	1	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of Chapter 18.	Remove the OLA from the property (Lot 2 DP 333700) and undertake consequential changes as necessary to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.
492	2	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The extent of the OLA on the submitter's property is unknown.	Identify the boundaries of the OLA on the submitter's property (preferably by survey) at no cost to the submitter.
492	5	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The description of the OLA states that 'the recent subdivision of the elevated land at the mouth of the harbour... has detracted significantly from this vegetated feature'. Does the submitter's property have capacity to absorb change (as noted in section 18.1).	Address the concerns of the submitter in the s42A report.
493	1	Alispahic, Natalie	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Is concerned about the impact the proposed changes will have on their property.	Remove outstanding landscape (OLA19: Sentinal Rock Coast) from their property, Lot 2 DP 333700.
493	7	Alispahic, Natalie	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	The OLA notation will invariably compromise our property rights and may render our land incapable of reasonable use.	Council to identify the boundaries of the proposed OLA (OLA 19: Sentinal Rock Coast) on Lot 2 DP 333 700.
519	1	Greer, John Foster	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Supports the inclusion of Taharoa Domain Reserve in OLA 6 but opposes the extension of OLA 6 into submitter's property. Submitter's land fails to meet description of OLA 6 in Appendix 18B and 9.95, as has more than minimum development.	Remove boundary of OLA 6 to domain property boundary.
529	1	Duck Nominees Ltd : Nathan, David :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Map 17 of OLA 14 - Bream Tail/Brynderwyn Ranges inaccurate extends into submitter's consented subdivisions in Cove road.	Exclude OLA 14 from Sanctuary subdivision property but for Lot 105 DP 404128.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
576[529]	20	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	Oppose	Opposes submission 529/1	Disallow submission 529/1
538	2	Schick, Gordon (Gus)	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Including the cadastral parcels identified as sections 126 - 093 on Map 11 of 14 within OLA 2 creates unnecessary expense with little benefit to the landscape.	Remove OLA 2 to the cadastral parcel delineation of sections 126 - 093 on Map 11 of 14.
5	1	Goulding & Gunson, Timothy John & Craig Wesley	Extent and Quality of OLA	Site specific	In Part	Supports the submission of Christopher Biddles (submitter number 4) and the identification of an outstanding natural feature on the covenanted area of lake and wetland areas on Plan SO 64650.	Remove OLA from all of the site except lake and wetland areas covenanted on Plan SO 64650.
268	1	Grieve, James	Extent and Quality of OLA	Support	Support	Council duty to preserve outstanding landscapes, for which they need do more. The extent and values of the OLAs need be revised.	Accept Appendix 18B and the boundary of these areas as OLAs. Council to continue to seek out landscapes for protection.
89	1	Leeves, John Ronald	Extent and Quality of OLA	VAL 35 - Bream Tail	In Part	The VAL of Bream Tail (VAL35) is extended eastward to reach the coast.	Extension of VAL 35 to the coast. Map attached to submission.
67	2	Investments, Poutu	Extent and Quality of OLA	VAL 46 - Backshore strip of grazed Dune north of Poutu	Oppose	Oppose VAL - Backshore Strip	Decline Backshore VAL, retain existing rules.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
540	3	Allen, Kevin Eric	Extent and Quality of VAL	General	Oppose	No negative visual effects in the submitter's area. Variation is unnecessary.	Leave system as it is.
557[540]	3	Allen, Kevin Eric	Extent and Quality of VAL	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 540/3.	Disallow submission 540/3.
474	1	Hiddles, Kim and Viv	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	OLA 2 be revised pending clarification of why my property is included because cliffs will naturally be preserved due to their physical nature and there is no need for further burdensome protection. The designation must be limited to a narrow strip defining the actual cliffs and clifftops.	OLA 2 be revised to exclude property as indicated on attachment to submission (referred to as OLA area 66)
149	1	Bull, P	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLAs in general	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of privately owned land in OLAs and VALs.	Exclude privately owned land from OLAs and VALs.
283	109	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLAs in general	Oppose		Restrict Visual Amenity Landscapes and Outstanding Landscape Areas to Council and Crown owned land only
405	5	Shearer, Craig	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLAs in general	Support	The submitter supports Appendix 18C - Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes	The submitter requests that Appendix 18C - Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes be retained.
442	1	Forde, Jeanette	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLAs in general	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and believes that no development should be allowed in them.	The submitter seeks that OLA's and VAL's be enlarged and additional area added in Mangawhai area.
599[442]	2	Stuart, Helen	Extent and Quality of VAL	OLAs in general	Support	Supports submission 442/1.	Allow submission 442/1.
184	1	Robertson, James and Sandy	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	Oppose	Property at 55 Maropiu Road does not meet the description of a landscape feature to be considered for a VAL.	Exclude property from VAL 9.
203	2	Smith, Merilyn	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	Oppose	Concern that the submitter's cleared farmland is included as a purple area [VAL] in Map 1 page 166, alongside pine forests and native bush.	Further investigation required before further spending on the Variation occurs.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
292	1	Oneriri Land Holdings Ltd : Hood, Brett :	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	N/A	VAL 33 extends over pasture areas of submitter's working farm and may constrain it's operative use.	Amend VAL 33 to exclude submitter's property.
310	9	Savage, Keith and Velma	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	Oppose	VAL 6 extends over property at 91 McLean Road. Falsely described as Donnelly's Crossing Bush North but is beef grazing land with small pockets of bush only.	Reduce rates of affected landowner.
344	1	Wright, Rawson	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	N/A	Submitter is to determine the impact the classification of VALs may have on adjacent land in Punahaere Creek and Harbour Edge, Okara Creek and Harbour Edge, Inner Pouto lands - Pouto Papakainga (below Waikaretu Marae,) and seaward lands at Pouto point. Potential impacts on wellbeing have yet to be considered in consultation.	Consultation including cultural and details on the effects on their property required before further action.
385	4	Beskeen, Andrew	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	Oppose	Submitter's property does not qualify as a VAL, which is not defined in the RMA.	Remove VAL from submitter's property.
525	1	Bowring, Ian and Glenda	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	Oppose	Submitter's property Lot 1 DP 197211 does not justify identification as a VAL.	Remove VAL from our land (Lot 1 DP 197211).
533	1	Botica, Groz and Jose	Extent and Quality of VAL	Site specific	In Part	The extent of the OLA need to be revised pending clarification of why the property is included, as back boundary has been excluded.	Amend the boundary of OLA [not specified] to coincide with rear boundary. Map number not specified.
475	1	Campbell, Len	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 1 - Waipoua Forest fringes	Oppose	VAL impacts on private property rights.	Remove VAL from property - identified in submission (Waima River Road).
240	1	Younger, Michael Paul and Cindy May	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 11 - Maungaru Range bush fringes	Oppose	Extent of VAL 11 is greater than bush land on property. Appendix G is correct.	Limit VAL 11 to the extent shown in Appendix G.
511	1	McDermott, Terence	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 11 - Maungaru Range bush fringes	Oppose	Submitter's land, within VAL 11, is no different to other land in the district.	Withdrawal from Plan.
511	2	McDermott, Terence	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 11 - Maungaru Range bush fringes	Oppose	VAL 11 will devalue land and reduce saleability.	Complete withdrawal from the Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
519	2	Greer, John Foster	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 11 - Maungaru Range bush fringes	Oppose	Ngakiri Paranui Stream, bush and wetland has little visual amenity and should not be protected; has no public viewing points and is all farmland or forestry.	Delete from Variation, from Appendix 18G Map 1 of 2.
201	1	Bradley, Aaron and Joanne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 16 - Manganui wetlands and bush	Oppose	Are committed to protecting landscape but freehold private property not to be deemed VALs.	Exclude private property at Maunganui Bluff bush fringes.
471	1	Nicholas, Kevin and Judy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 16 - Manganui wetlands and bush	Oppose	VAL 16 covers private farmland which was not identified as a VAL by the public.	Remove VAL 16.
577[471]	1	Simpkin, William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 16 - Manganui wetlands and bush	Oppose	Opposes submission 471/1	Disallow submission 471/1
588[471]	1	Leigh-MacKenzie, Chris	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 16 - Manganui wetlands and bush	Oppose	Support.	Accept.
162	1	Finncane, Gary Philip Morris	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	Exclude property from Omaru Valley Bush VAL as is of no visual significance, will reduce value, prohibits future use and render the land less desirable.	Exclude property from VAL.
275	1	Stevens, Gary	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	Contests inclusion of submitter's lifestyle block property within VAL 19. Concern for decrease in value and restrictions for future consent applications.	Amend VAL 19 to exclude property.
394	1	Borger, Bert	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	The Omaru Valley Bush is not worthy of protection based on its visual amenity.	Delete VAL 19 from Appendix G.
432	1	Blythen, Grant Terence	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that their property is included in VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush.	The submitter seeks that blocks of land that don't have original native bush on them are removed from the VAL's
560[432]	2	Stuart, Ian William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Support	Supports submission 432/1	Allow submission 432/1
432	2	Blythen, Grant Terence	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	The submitter states that the Omaru Valley is mostly made up of gorse and pine tree plantations.	The submitter seeks that restrictions on businesses stop and that more consultation be carried out with landowners.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
560[432]	3	Stuart, Ian William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Support	Supports submission 432/2	Allow submission 432/2
448	1	Stevens, Gary	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush	Oppose	The submitter does not want their property included in VAL 19 - Omaru Valley Bush.	The submitter seeks that VAL 19 be amended to exclude the submitters 3 lifestyle blocks
191	1	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	Chapter 18, OLAs and VALs place an unreasonable burden on land owners/interested parties of/in privately owned land.	Restrict VAL 21 to the pocket of native bush situated on Birch Road and currently defined as the Parahi Scenic Reserve.
372	3	Sandford, Alan Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to bush on their farm being included in the VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve Bush.	The submitter seeks that if their property is currently included in the VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve Bush, that it is omitted.
372	4	Sandford, Alan Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	In Part	The submitter supports the inclusion of the bush on Birch Road in VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve Bush.	The submitter seeks that the bush on Birch Road be all that is included in VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve Bush.
433	1	Bryham, Gregory Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve and says that there are factual inaccuracies in the description and mapping of it.	The submitter seeks that the boundaries of VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve are amended to be more accurate, without reference to watercourses or the Omaru River.
433	2	Bryham, Gregory Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve.	The submitter requests that VAL 21 - Parahi scenic Reserve is reduced to exclude farms situated at 451 and 583 Lusk Road, 220 Page Road and 301 Parahi Outlet Road.
433	3	Bryham, Gregory Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	The submitter opposes the number of properties included in VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve.	The submitter seeks that the existing pocket of native bush situated on Birch Road and currently defined as the Parahi Scenic Reserve, should be all that is included in this variation.
433	4	Bryham, Gregory Paul	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	The submitter is not satisfied with the accuracy of mapping and description of the Parahi Scenic Reserve.	The submitter seeks that the proposed Parahi Scenic Reserve is removed from Chapter 18 until Council supplies affected landholders with accurate and current mapping and an accurate description of the same.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
505	1	Bryham, Shelley Anne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve bush	Oppose	VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve incorporates areas lacking remnants of indigenous bush and includes farmland, residential properties and pine plantation.	Delete VAL 21 from Variation until accurate mapping of the area is produced. Exclude from VAL 21 farms at 451 and 583 Lusk Road, 220 Page Road and 301 Parahi Outlet Road. Provide clear and accurate mapping excluding 451 and 583 Lusk Road, 220(?) Page Road and 301 Parahi Outlet Road (only the native bush on Birch Road).
199	2	Wrightson, Michael	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 22 - Ararua Road bush and wetlands	Oppose	VAL 22 - Ararua Road bush and wetlands has been inaccurately described and identified.	Restrict VAL 22 to the watershed of the Manganui River catchment.
315	1	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 22 - Ararua Road bush and wetlands	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL 22 - Ararua Road bush & wetlands	The submitter seeks that Chapter 18 is revised to exclude all private property from VAL's
194	1	Smith, Clive McLaren	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 24 - Rehia	In Part	Management of land and farming operations in Rehia are more practicable distinct from the Council's interference.	Remove VAL 24 - Rehia from the Variation.
247	1	Percy, Rachel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 25 - Pahi River Bush	Oppose	VAL 25 is not exceptional.	Delete VAL 25.
247	2	Percy, Rachel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 25 - Pahi River Bush	Oppose	The bush in VAL 25 is sufficiently protected by a QEII covenant. The rest of the area is unexceptional.	Delete VAL 25.
425	1	Jones, Elizabeth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 25 - Pahi River Bush	Oppose	Area included in VAL 25 is not unique in the Kaipara District. The species of trees described in the description of the VAL are already protected.	Delete words from VAL 25 and remove from Appendix G.
194	2	Smith, Clive McLaren	Extent and Quality of VAL	Val 26 - Te Mateotetawa Creek Bush	In Part	The submitter's property has no road frontage and significant private heritage value, control of which should be practised without interference by the Council.	Remove VAL 26 - Te Mateotetawa Creek Bush from the Variation.
175	1	Finlayson, Kenneth Carran Maclean	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 30 - Wairau River / Pukekaroro Bush	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL 30 - Wairau River / Pukekaroro bush.	The submitter seeks that VAL 30 - Wairau River / Pukekaroro bush not include their property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
484	25	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 31 - Pukearenga bush	Support	Supports the area of VAL 31 subject to it abutting the boundaries of OLA 16.	Confirmation that there are no gaps between VAL 31 and OLA 16.
30	1	Meyer, Mark William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 32 - Otamatea River bush	In Part	Supports the VAL Area including the 'Otamatea Bush' and proposes it be extended to include the opposite side of the Otamatea River.	VAL Area including the 'Otamatea Bush' be extended to include the area on the opposite side of the Otamatea River. Map provided.
134	2	Palmer Shanahan, Margaret, Brian, Kate and Jeremy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 34 - Tara Road bush	In Part	The submitter partially supports VAL 34 with proposed amendments	The submitter seeks that the 1.3ha part of their property [map provided by submitter] should be converted to OLA instead of VAL.
484	27	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 34 - Tara Road bush	In Part	Area boundaries of VAL 34 are unclear. Submitters want to ensure that vegetation of significance is included in the defined area.	Clarification of boundaries to ensure significant vegetation is included within area of VAL 34.
444	8	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 35 - Bream Tail	In Part	The submitter supports VAL 35 - Bream Tail Bush.	The submitter seeks that the boundaries of VAL 35 are clarified.
444	9	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 35 - Bream Tail	In Part	The submitter supports in part VAL 35 - Bream Tail Bush.	The submitter seeks that VAL 35 is amended so that there are no gaps between it and the OLA areas surrounding it.
484	30	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 35 - Bream Tail	In Part	Area boundaries of VAL 35 are unclear. Submitters want to ensure that vegetation of significance is included in the defined area.	Clarification of boundaries to ensure significant vegetation is included within area of VAL 35.
470	1	Ball, Kevin Wilfred	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 37 - Massey Road Bush	In Part	Identification of VAL 37 Massey Road Bush not accurate.	Amend VAL 37 to include bush area only.
107	1	Lyne, Brendan Charles Daniel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 46 - Backshore strip of grazed Dune north of Pouto	Oppose	VAL 46 affects private land.	Revise VAL 46 boundary to avoid private land at Aranga Beach/Maunganui Bluff.
107	2	Lyne, Brendan Charles Daniel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VAL 46 - Backshore strip of grazed Dune north of Pouto	Oppose	VAL 46 affects private land.	Restrict VAL designation to the reserve at Aranga Beach/Maunganui Bluff.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
110	4	Hogan, Jonathon	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
11	1	Hales, Graeme	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	Opposes a management plan that will limit their ability to manage their own land.	Submitter's land, which is part of Maretu Forest, to be excluded from a management plan that would limit their ability to manage their own land.
137	4	Dalbeth, Valerie	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
141	4	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
142	4	Murray, Reade Patrick	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
143	4	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
147	4	Engeler, George	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
153	4	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
154	6	Taylor, Joan Eva	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	N/A	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
166	4	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
169	4	Mulherm, M E	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
170	4	Hadlow, C L	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
171	4	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
173	4	Sills, Val Winston	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
174	6	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
175	2	Finlayson, Kenneth Carran Maclean	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes VALs	The submitter seeks that VAL's are removed from the planning maps and rules in the district plan.
176	4	Jones, Graham Laurence	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
177	5	Awhitu, Lucy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
184	2	Robertson, James and Sandy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	VALs restrict land use and devalue land.	Exclude all property from VALs unless volunteered.
185	5	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
190	6	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
191	3	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	VALs are not a specific directive of the Environment Court's decision, offering no additional environmental protection and burdening landowners with onerous requirements. The current District Plan ensures environmental protection by private land owners.	Restrict VAL 21 to the pocket of native bush situated on Birch Road currently defined as the Parahi Scenic Reserve only.
229	4	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
235	4	Forrest, Logan James	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
239	5	Russell, Keith Ernest	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
245	6	Legarth, Larson	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
246	5	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
256	1	Matthew Bradbury, Alison Stillwell	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	Paparoa Bush Reserve, Pa Site, and Walkway provides visual amenity for surrounding localities.	Paparoa Bush Reserve be identified as a VAL on Map 2, Appendix 6.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
259	4	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
260	3	Hastie, Deborah	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes all VAL's in Variation 1 - Landscapes	The submitter seeks that VAL's are left out of Chapter 18.
263	4	Draper, William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
264	4	Fernandez, Jenni	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
273	4	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
274	4	Poole, Raymond George	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
276	4	Robinson, Perrin	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
278	4	Miller, James Wynard	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
279	4	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
280	4	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
281	4	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
283	1	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Inclusion of Visual Amenity Landscapes is not supported. There is no justification given for their inclusion in the Section 32 report.	Remove reference to Visual Amenity Landscapes from Variation 1.
284	4	Andrew, L J and N E	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
285	4	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
286	3	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Management of private land should be left to landowners/farmers. Chapter 18 imposes an unfair and unreasonable burden on landowners.	Delete VALs.
286	7	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
287	4	MacLean, Angus	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
288	4	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
289	4	Guest, W J and N M	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
293	4	Lulich, Leonard S	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
294	4	Williamson, Robert John	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
295	4	Brown, Stuart WJ	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
296	4	Woodcock, Rodney	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
612[296]	4	Woodcock, Rodney	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/4.	Disallow submission 296/4.
297	4	Underwood, Steven and Fracesca	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
298	4	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
299	2	Combe Head Farms : Morshead, Pamela :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Private land should be managed by landowners.	Exclude all privately owned land from VALs.
300	4	Stopher, Allan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
301	4	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
302	4	Howard, Marie Hazel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
303	4	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
303	9	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Inaccurate descriptions of land identified as VALs. Mature pine forest and bare hillside has been included. Poor research and damaging conservation practice e.g. removal of trees at Kai Iwi Lakes dictating land use.	Exclude the VAL notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
304	4	Sapiatzer, Peter	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
305	4	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
306	4	Walker, John and Sjannie	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
307	4	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
308	4	Bull, Josph Arthur	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
309	4	Ulrich, Lorraine Tereza	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
310	4	Savage, Keith and Velma	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
311	4	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
312	4	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
313	4	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
314	4	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
315	2	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictions on landowners from Chapter 18.	The submitter seeks that all reference to VAL's are removed from the proposed district plan
315	3	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter does not consider that the November Environment Court decision required Council to put VAL's in the district plan.	The submitter seeks that all reference to VAL's in the district plan are removed.
316	4	Hardy, Isabell	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
317	4	House, Stuart Henderson	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
318	4	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
319	4	Otway, Brian Kay	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
320	4	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
321	4	Smith, Kevin and Merilyn	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
322	4	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
323	4	Kemp, Harry	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
324	4	Subritzky, Desmond	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
326	4	Appleton, Gordon George	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
327	4	Bennett, Kawyn	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
328	4	Reed, Douglas	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
329	4	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
3	4	Sellars, Chris	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
330	4	Taurua, Bernice	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
331	4	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
332	4	Ludvigson, Tanya	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
335	4	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
336	4	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
337	4	Ruiterman, A T	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
338	4	Linton, David	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
339	4	Davies, Rhys John	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
341	4	Ballantyne, I K	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
342	4	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
343	4	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
345	4	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
347	4	Gatti, Susan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
348	4	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
349	4	Williams, Murray	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
350	4	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
351	4	Lees, Tom	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
352	4	Donegan, Julia	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
353	4	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
354	4	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
355	4	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
356	4	Appleton, Lester Winston	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
357	4	Reid, R T S	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
358	4	He, Lisa	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
361	4	Lusty, David James	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
362	4	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
363	4	Vallance, John And Cathy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
364	4	Warnes, Stuart	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
365	4	Wood, Steven and Susan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
366	4	McEvoy, R J and A	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
367	4	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
368	4	Robinson, Asa	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
369	4	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
370	4	Brown, Aland and Judith	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
381	4	Ward, Allison Anne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
383	5	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter does not believe that VAL's were a specific directive from the Environment Court decision.	Withdraw VAL's
383	8	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter states that there is unclear and inadequate mapping and reasons as to why the VAL's and OLA's have been highlighted as valued.	No decision sought.
387	4	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
387	8	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	While there is some argument for iconic landscapes there is no justification to impact on private property for VALs.	Not stated.
388	4	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
389	4	Malam, Anne Marie	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
392	4	Anderson, Audrey	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
393	1	Hita, Ben	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Oppose VAL notation at Okaro Creek, Waikere creek, Lake Humuhumu and surrounding land [identified as VAL 40 and 41 and OLA 22]. Council has no authority or consent from those with an interest in the land over this land. It amounts to alienation.	Delete Variation in entirety.
399	4	Ward, Chris	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
404	4	Sidwell, Craig	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
407	16	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court. There is no protection as no rules but would require consents.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
407	17	Nickolson, Dave	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
414	4	Green, Donna	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
415	2	Blaxall, Douglas	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes the VAL's.	The submitter requests that the VAL's be omitted from the plan.
416	4	Blitvic, Dwayne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
418	6	Wills, Edward	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
422	4	Blitvic, Elaine	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
424	4	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
426	1	Bower, Elizabeth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Submitter supports Variation 1 - Landscapes and seeks extra areas to be added to the VAL's	The submitter seeks that the Mangawhai Harbour and Estuary edges, coastlines (including Bream Tail Farm) and sand spits including the Te Ari Beach strip and the area of the Brynderwyns that is in KDC District to be included in the VAL's. The submitter seeks that Appendix 18C and Map Series 1, Map 17 of 60 are amended to reflect these additions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
428	4	Hooker, Gary	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
430	5	Fish, Isabel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
436	2	Croathwaite, Helen Mary	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	N/A	The submitter believes that the area surrounding the Piroa Falls of the Waipu 'Gorge Road' should be included in the VAL areas	The submitter seeks the inclusion of any or part of the bush that encompasses the stream leading to the Piroa falls as a protected area.
439	4	Anderson, Innes McRae	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
4	5	Biddles, Christopher	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Oppose VAL area on grazing land.	Remove VALs from the Proposed Plan.
440	4	Blitvic, Ivan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
443	4	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
444	1	Elliott, Jan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	The submitter supports in part the VAL's.	The submitter seeks that the Mangawhai Harbour and estuary edges, its coastline, Bream Tail Farm and sand spits, including the Te Arai Beach strip that the Wildlife Refuge Bird Sanctuary is situated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
449	1	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court. \	Remove VALs from Variation 1
449	2	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
450	16	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court. There is no protection as no rules but would require consents.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
450	17	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
453	3	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL's.	The submitter seeks that VAL's are deleted from the Planning Maps and any provisions pertaining to VAL's are deleted from the proposed District Plan.
589[453]	80	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Supports submission 453/3.	Accept submission 453/3.
603[453]	2	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in General	Oppose	Opposes submission 453/3.	Submission 453/3 be disallowed.
456	1	Jepson, Craig	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court.	Remove VALs from Variation 1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
456	2	Jepson, Craig	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
458	2	Anderson, John	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The submitter opposes VAL's.	The submitter seeks that VAL's are removed from Variation 1 - Landscapes.
462	1	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court.	Remove VALs from Variation 1
462	2	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
464	3	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	Appendix G is inconsistent with other Chapters of the Proposed District Plan as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is little or no ground truthing; - They are indicative only; - They don't recognise VALs outside these areas; - The VALs have not been consulted on with the public or landowners; - Amenity values should be at least consistent with the Heritage chapter of the Proposed District Plan in relation to landowner consent objectives and policies. 	Remove all maps in Appendix G and leave as a space saver for future VALs which are included after identification and landowner consent has been achieved. Update Appendix 18B accordingly.
465	1	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan is not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court.	Remove VALs from Variation 1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
465	2	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
467	1	Dugdale, Kenneth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan is not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court.	Remove VALs from Variation 1
467	2	Dugdale, Kenneth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
469	4	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
470	3	Ball, Kevin Wilfred	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Privately owned land should be excluded.	Exclude privately owned freehold land.
477	4	Davey, Louanne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
478	1	George, Mack Russell	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Oppose VAL notation at Okaro Creek, Waikere creek, Lake Humuhumu and surrounding land [identified as VAL 40 and 41 and OLA 22]. Council has no authority or consent from those with an interest in the land over this land. It amounts to alienation.	Not stated.
482	2	Gash, Mark William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The extent of the VAL need to be revised as property included is grassed and unsuitable.	Delete VAL [not specified] Appendix 18B pending accurate definition of the areas. Map 17 of 60 should be amended.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
483	4	Baines, Martin Hamer	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
484	4	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	A robust process in determining how 'consideration is to be given to their values' is required.	Commitment to ensuring a qualified expert is engaged to undertake assessment of VALs is necessary to achieve satisfactory outcomes.
484	6	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	18.1 (first sentence under subheading VALs) should also refer to the planning maps.	Amendment to 18.1 (first sentence under subheading VALs) to also refer to the areas being shown on maps.
484	7	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	18.1 (last sentence in second paragraph under VAL subheading) should also refer to the planning maps for information purposes.	Amendment to 18.1 (final sentence in second paragraph under VAL subheading) to also refer to maps.
487	1	Pairama-Hart, Marilee Harata	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Oppose VAL notation at Okaro Creek, Waikere creek, Lake Humuhumu and surrounding land [identified as VAL 40 and 41 and OLA 22]. Council has no authority or consent from those with an interest in the land over this land. It amounts to alienation.	Not stated.
488	2	Beatty, Michael and Jan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Identification of VALs ambiguous, open for abuse and over use.	Exclude OLAs and VALs from privately owned land unless consulted with and granted consent from landowner. Landowner to have the right to decline the provision of an OLA or VAL on their property.
491	4	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
492	16	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court. There is no protection as no rules but would require consents.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
492	17	Grierson, Monique	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
493	4	Alispahic, Natalie	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Visual Amenity Landscapes were not a specific directive of the Court and provide a burden to landowners.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.
500	11	Legarth, Olivia	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	VAL notation does not provide additional protection to landscapes with no rules. Landowners within VALs are burdened with onerous consenting requirements.	Delete VALs in entirety.
502	4	Halse, Robyne	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
503	1	Cullen, Shane Noel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs within the Plan are not necessary to meet the obligations of the RMA, and was not a specific directive of the Environment Court.	Remove VALs from Variation 1
503	2	Cullen, Shane Noel	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs will compromise the ability of landowners to provide for their economic and social wellbeing by burdening landowners in their proximity with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove VALs from Variation 1.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
504	4	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
506	4	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements. Council should consider purchasing the private land affected.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
510	4	Fish, Terence Henry	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
514	4	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
522	5	Vallancey, William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	N/A	Questions criteria for identifying VALs.	Requests information, in layman terms, on the process of selecting VALs.
566[522]	5	Vallancey, William	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	N/A	Supports submission 522/5	Allow submission 522/5
523	4	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	Flexible rules regarding subdivision in VALs.	No subdivision in VALs, or align subdivision rules with the Waterways Overlays rules.
526	3	Goulding, Timothy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	VALs are already protected by land covenants on the land and notation is unnecessary and costly. Coastal flats identified are used as pastoral grazing and are not publically visible.	Exclude the property from VAL identification.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
526	7	Goulding, Timothy	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
538	3	Schick, Gordon (Gus)	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	In Part	VALs should not be included in Variation 1, but held until NRPS is complete.	Exclude VALs from the Variation pending an Environment Court decision on the acceptability of the VAL scheme.
542	3	Jones, Charlotte	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Visual amenity is not a landscape assessment under the RMA and is unnecessary.	Delete rules from Variation that are based on visual amenity.
552	1	Gray, Daniel Tewira	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Oppose VAL notation at Okaro Creek, Waikere creek, Lake Humuhumu and surrounding land [identified as VAL 40 and 41 and OLA 22]. Council has no authority or consent from those with an interest in the land over this land. It amounts to alienation.	Not stated.
553	4	Paterson, CR and CL	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
554	1	McKinnon, Ian Donald	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Questions inclusion of fenced off pine plantation on in VAL and the implications of this notation. Wetland on the property is rightly included.	Clarify inclusion of pine in VAL and the rules which will apply to the use of this land and neighbouring land.
555	4	Carter, W M	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
70	8	Smith, Edward John	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
7	3	Hancock Forest Management NZ : Buckingham, Ursula :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Not clear how the VAL fits into the current Plan and Rules section and the effect on HFM NZ operations.	Provide clarification on implementation of VAL in relation to new and existing plantation forestry activities.
7	4	Hancock Forest Management NZ : Buckingham, Ursula :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	Onerous to require resource consents to carry out normal forestry activities in a rural environment.	1. Remove all plantation forestry from VALs. 2. Allow forestry and quarrying as a permitted activity in these zones.
8	5	Underwood, Kenneth	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
604[8]	238	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Supports submission 8/5	Allow submission 8/5
90	3	Curreen, Helen	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Supports VALs (in particular VAL 34 and VAL 35) as a concept. Important not to be inhibited by what already exists and to prevent further intrusions in the landscape.	Enlarge VAL areas and make specific rules in relation to Appendix 18c(a) to (w) (no map provided).
90	4	Curreen, Helen	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Proposes new VAL at the Old Waipu Road ridgeline and bush.	Allocate Old Waipu Road ridgeline and bush VAL status (no map provided). Make specific rules in relation to Appendix 18c(a) to (w).
90	5	Curreen, Helen	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Support	Proposes new VAL at the Pearl Street extension.	Allocate Pearl Street extension VAL status (no map provided). Make specific rules in relation to Appendix 18c(a) to (w)
92	6	Bishop, Robert Alan	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
96	4	Russell, Ian	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.
97	5	Hindrup, Ray	Extent and Quality of VAL	VALs in general	Oppose	The inclusion of VALs was not a specific directive of the Environment Court and does not offer these landscapes any additional protection, but rather burdens landowners with onerous consenting requirements.	Remove all references to VALs from the Proposed District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	2	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	General Policy Framework	None	N/A	Submitter raises concerns that objectives, policies and outcomes within Chapter 4 overlap and in some instances, duplicate the provisions in Chapter 18. Chapter 18 be amended to explicitly state that this Chapter addresses the management of the natural character values of the District including provisions that provide for the preservation of the natural character values of the coastal environment and lake, river, wetland margins from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Submitter notes that they have sought Chapter 4 be withdrawn and that Chapter 18 be amended to explicitly state that this Chapter addresses the management of the natural character values of the District including provisions that provide for the preservation of the natural character values of the coastal environment and lake, river, wetland margins from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. Also any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
589[486]	7	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	General Policy Framework	None	Support	Supports submission 486/2.	Accept submission 486/2.
175	3	Finlayson, Kenneth Carran Maclean	General Policy Framework	Oppose	Oppose	Submitter opposes Issue 18.5.4, Objective 18.6.2, Policy 18.7.2 and Method 18.8.1.	No decision sought.
498	3	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	General Policy Framework	Oppose	N/A	Outstanding Natural Features are not addressed in Variation 1 but are sensitive to land disturbance activities.	Amend the Chapter 18 Objectives, Policies, Methods and outcomes to protect outstanding natural features and give effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS 2010. Example wording provided.
589[498]	20	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	General Policy Framework	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 498/3.	Accept submission 498/3.
602[498]	13	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	General Policy Framework	Oppose	Oppose	Opposes submission 498/3	Disallow submission 498/3
517	2	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	General Policy Framework	Support	In Part	The submitter states that the support OLA's and VAL's with assurances that they can run transmission lines through them if that is the best practicable option.	The submitter seeks that the policy framework of the proposed plan should give effect to the National Environment Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009.
195	1	Mace, Megan and Andy	General Policy Framework	Support	In Part	Protection of the Brynderwyn Hills in entirety from subdivision and interference with bushland needed .	Protect all of the Brynderwyn Hills from development (no map provided).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	9	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	How to Use This Chapter of the District Plan - 18.4	None	In Part	Amend paragraph 3 of Section 18.4 for sense, clarity and accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	9	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	How to Use This Chapter of the District Plan - 18.4	None	In Part	Amend paragraph 3 of Section 18.4 for sense, clarity and accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
463	6	Kaipara District Council :	How to Use This Chapter of the District Plan - 18.4	None	In Part	The submitter states that 'green friendly notes' are included in the Proposed District Plan Chapters but have not been included in Variation 1 - Landscapes.	The submitter seeks that 'green friendly notes' be included in Sections 18.1 - Introduction and 18.4 - How to use this Chapter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
25	2	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Introduction - 18.1	None	Support	Supports 18.1 - Introduction to the OLAs and VALs including the approach towards VALs (which outlines the absence of rules for VALs).	Retain section 18.1.
378	1	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to paragraph 1 for accuracy and to show that a process has been followed.	Amend with wording provided by submitter to show that a process has been followed.
378	2	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to paragraph 6.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	3	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to the wording in paragraph 7 for accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	4	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to the wording on paragraph 8 for accuracy and clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	5	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking changes to the OLA subsection of 18.1 so that it accurately reflects the landscape assessment methodology and for clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	6	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking changes to the VAL subsection of 18.1 so that it accurately reflects the landscape assessment methodology and for clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	3	Hawley, Catherine and John	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	The section on OLAs should be amended for accuracy, clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend the section on OLAs in section 18.1 as set out in the submission.
397	4	Hawley, Catherine and John	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	The section on VALs should be amended for accuracy, clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend the section on VALs in section 18.1 as set out in the submission.
451	1	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to paragraph 1 for accuracy and to show that a process has been followed.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	2	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to paragraph 6.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	3	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to the wording in paragraph 7 for accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	4	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking amendments to the wording on paragraph 8 for accuracy and clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	5	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking changes to the OLA subsection of 18.1 so that it accurately reflects the landscape assessment methodology and for clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	6	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	Submitter is seeking changes to the VAL subsection of 18.1 so that it accurately reflects the landscape assessment methodology and for clarity and to remove repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
463	5	Kaipara District Council :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	The submitter states that there is some repetition in the paragraphs 6 and 7 in the second column of Section 18.1 - Introduction.	The submitter seeks that paragraphs 6 and 7 in the second column of Section 18.1 - Introduction are consolidated to remove repetition, such as the reference to Appendix G.
589[463]	64	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Introduction - 18.1	None	Support	Supports submission 463/5.	Accept submission 463/5.
484	1	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Introduction - 18.1	None	In Part	There should be no (rather than limited) development within OLAs.	To adopt a precautionary approach and permit no development within OLAs
601[484]	1	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Introduction - 18.1	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 484/1	Disallow submission 484/1
602[484]	15	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Introduction - 18.1	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 484/1	Disallow submission 484/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	5	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Introduction - 18.1	None	N/A	The criteria to classify OLAs and the s32 report show that the Landscape Assessment of Variation 1 evaluated natural character values as per s6(a) RMA and outstanding natural features and landscapes as per s6(b)RMA. This is not considered to be explicitly noted in Section 18.1 of the Variation.	That Section 18.1 be amended to make it explicit that the OLAs and VALs have been developed following an evaluation in terms of outstanding natural features and landscapes (as per s6(b) RMA) and natural character values (as per s6(a) RMA), as well as addressing the NZCPS 1994 and Sections 7 and 8 of the NRC Regional Coastal Plan for Northland 1994. The submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
486	6	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Introduction - 18.1	None	N/A	Section 18.1 should be amended to be more consistent with Part II of the RMA and refer to 'protection' not 'preservation' of OLAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Delete criterion (d), (f) and (g) from the list of criteria determining landscape value from section 18.1 and amend paragraph 9 with wording supplied by submitter (deleting 'pressure'). Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
563	1	Dalbeth, Valerie	Invalid	None	N/A		
186	1	Munn, Munn Doug	Invalid	None	N/A	Not stated.	Not stated.
564	1	Dalbeth, Herbert	Invalid	None	N/A		
610	1	Legarth, Larson	Invalid	None	N/A		
586	1	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Invalid	None	N/A		
290	1	/, /	Invalid	None	Oppose	Plan will result in destruction of trees at Kai Iwi Lakes.	Not stated.
325	1	/, /	Invalid	None	Oppose	Privately owned land in VAL 37 - Massey Road Bush does not require protection via legislative interference.	Exclude private land from VALs.
611	1	Berghan, Gayleen	Invalid	None	N/A		
561	1	Gaukrodger, Brian Warren	Invalid	None	N/A		
565	1	Baker, Christopher John	Invalid	None	N/A		
596	1	Pryde, Andrew	Invalid	None	N/A		
597	1	Drake, Christopher James	Invalid	None	N/A		
600	1	Pryde, Susannah Kate	Invalid	None	N/A		
607	1	Hunt, Monica and Stan	Invalid	None	N/A		
609	1	Jamieson, Andrew	Invalid	None	N/A		
237	1	/ : /, / :	Duplicate Submission	None	N/A		
376	1	/, /	Duplicate Submission	None	N/A		

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
452	5	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Issue	General	N/A	Landscape values exist outside identified OLAs and VALs. These are likely to be at a site or area specific scale but deserve recognition and appropriate management.	Add and Issue for landscapes outside OLA's and VAL's.
606[452]	9	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Issue	General	Oppose	Oppose submission 452/5.	Submission 452/5 be disallowed.
602[452]	16	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Issue	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 452/5	Disallow submission 452/5
25	3	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Supports in part issue 18.5.1 in that it recognises inappropriate development has the potential to threaten OLAs and VALs however the issue needs amendment to provide for consistency in using the word 'inappropriate'.	Amend issue 18.5.1 with text additions and deletions provided by the submitter, for consistent use of terminology.
25	4	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Supports in part however the issue needs amendment as the last part of the paragraph is not considered necessary as the matters are covered in the accompanying text.	Amend issue by deleting selected explanation text as provided by the submitter.
283	2	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	Oppose	The explanation does not specifically refer to VALs. There are no rules to support the inclusion of VALS in this issue.	Remove reference to Visual Amenity Landscapes from Variation 1.
283	3	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	Oppose	The term inappropriate single species planting suggests forestry activities are not support in OLAs and VALS.	Clarify term, inappropriate single species planting.
373	4	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Inappropriate planting and prominent siting is a more accurate description than single species planting and ridgelines in terms of threats on Outstanding Landscapes.	From the explanation delete words "single species" from the second to last paragraph. Delete words "on ridgelines" from the last paragraph and change the sentence to read "...landscape, and or by their prominent siting".
378	10	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Issue 18.5.1 should be amended to make it clear and consistent with s6(b) of the RMA, and for clarity, accuracy and to avoid repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	9	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Issue 18.5.1 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and repetition.	Amend issue 18.5.1 as sought in the submission.
451	10	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Issue 18.5.1 should be amended to make it clear and consistent with s6(b) of the RMA, and for clarity, accuracy and to avoid repetition.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
453	4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	The submitter states that the protection of landscapes needs to be balanced with peoples need to provide for their economic, social and cultural wellbeing.	The submitter seeks that Issue 18.5.1 is amended to acknowledge that a balance between protection of landscapes and enabling intent of the RMA is required, to read as follows: 'Recognising that inappropriate subdivision, use and development has the potential to threaten the values of Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes, while enabling people and communities to provide for their economic, social and cultural well beings.' or words to that effect.
464	5	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Issue 18.5.1 should relate to OLAs only as OLAs and VALs are two different issues.	Remove words 'and Visual Amenity Landscapes' from Issue 18.5.1
486	8	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Issue	Issue 18.5.1	In Part	Wording of Issue 18.5.1 is generally appropriate, but the Explanation accompanying this is unnecessary. If the Explanation is retained it needs to be amended so that it is consistent with the Issue.	Delete the Explanation to Issue 18.5.1. If the Explanation is retained it should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
25	5	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Support	Support issue as the wording is consistent with Part II of the RMA however there is a lack of consistency in wording between the issue and explanation.	Clarify accompanying explanation by adding reference to the use and development of land supporting social and economic well-being being provided for.
283	4	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	Maintenance and enhancement of VALs cannot be achieved as there are no rules requiring this.	Remove reference to Visual Amenity Landscapes from Variation 1.
283	5	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	The Section 32 analysis has not evaluated the social or economic cost of the Variation. OLA on private property compromises on-going reasonable use.	Exclude private property from OLAs.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
373	5	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	More appropriate wording could be used in the explanation.	Replace the explanation with: "Some people have a perception that identifying landscapes in plans detracts from the value and development potential of a property. However landscapes make a significant contribution to the value of land and contribute to economic development, e.g. through increased opportunities for recreation and tourism activities or encouraging people to live and work within or view of distinctive or iconic landscapes."
601[373]	2	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/5	Disallow submission 373/5
378	11	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	Issue 18.5.2 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
395	5	Calveley, C	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	Fails to recognise that identification of OLAs may reduce/eliminate economic and productive potential of rural land.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	36	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	5	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	Fails to recognise that identification of OLAs may reduce/eliminate economic and productive potential of rural land.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	50	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	10	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	Issue 18.5.2 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend issue 18.5.2 as sought in the submission.
451	11	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	Issue 18.5.2 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
453	5	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	The submitter opposes the reference to VAL's in Issue 18.5.2.	The submitter seeks that Issue 18.5.2 is amended to delete reference to VAL's.
464	6	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	Issue 18.5.2 is subjective and needs to reflect this.	Insert 'have the potential to' after the words starting 'In reality landscapes' within the explanation.
486	9	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	In Part	The wording of Issue 18.5.2 is generally appropriate but should be amended to be more consistent with s6(a) and (b) of the RMA. The Explanation accompanying this Issue is considered unnecessary and does not explain Issue 18.5.2.	Issue 18.5.2 should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter and the explanation should be deleted. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
498	15	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	N/A	The explanation to Issue 18.5.2 does not support the issue.	Amend explanation to Issue 18.5.2 to better reflect that Part 2 RMA requires both the protection of matters of national importance and social and economic well-being to be provided for.
518	7	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.2	Oppose	The wording of Issue 18.5.2 means that the 'reasonable' use of Baldrock Estate will not be possible if OLA 15 is included in the District Plan.	No decision specified.
25	6	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Support	Supports issue's use of 'inappropriate' and 'manage effects'.	Retain wording of 'inappropriate' and 'manage effects' in the issue.
25	7	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	In Part	The term 'or adjacent to these areas' is vague, uncertain and open to interpretation.	Amend Issue 18.5.3 by deleting words as set out in the submission relating to activities 'adjacent to'.
283	6	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Oppose	It will be difficult for landowners to use and develop their land.	Exclude private property from OLAs.
378	12	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	In Part	Issue 18.5.3 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
395	6	Calveley, C	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Oppose	Lack of specificity as refers to adjacent land without creating any degree of certainty as to how the adjacent land will be assessed.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[395]	37	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	6	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Oppose	Lack of specificity as refers to adjacent land without creating any degree of certainty as to how the adjacent land will be assessed.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	51	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	11	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	In Part	Issue 18.5.3 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend issue 18.5.3 as sought in the submission.
451	12	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	In Part	Issue 18.5.3 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
486	10	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	In Part	Wording of Issue 18.5.3 is considered generally appropriate but should be amended to be more consistent with s6(a) and (b) of the RMA.	Issue 18.5.3 should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
498	9	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	N/A	Issue 18.5.3 implies the Plan will manage land use adjacent to identified OLA. It should be explicit where this control is applied.	Amend explanation to Issue 18.5.3 to remove the words "or adjacent to".
606[498]	15	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Support	Supports submission 498/9.	Submission 498/9 be allowed.
518	8	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.3	Oppose	The wording of Issue 18.5.3 will mean that the 'reasonable' use of Baldrock Estate will not be possible if OLA 15 is included in the District Plan.	No decision specified.
25	8	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	In Part	Intent of issue is supported however the issue needs amending to insert the words 'inappropriate' and 'adverse' for consistency and clarification purposes.	Amend Issue 18.5.4 as set out in wording provided by the submitter for 'inappropriate' to be recognised.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	7	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	Oppose	There are no rules to support the issue. Assessment criteria are onerous / costly to address. The inclusion of VALs will not achieve the outcomes sought by Variation 1.	Exclude private property from VALs
378	13	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	In Part	Issue 18.5.4 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter to acknowledge earthworks.
397	12	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	In Part	Issue 18.5.4 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend issue 18.5.4 as sought in the submission to acknowledge earthworks.
451	13	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	In Part	Issue 18.5.4 should be amended for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter to acknowledge earthworks.
453	6	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes Issue 18.5.4.	The submitter seeks that Issue 18.5.4 is deleted.
464	7	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Issue	Issue 18.5.4	In Part	Issue 18.5.4 is overly complicated.	Delete wording beyond 'development' in issue 18.5.4 and delete the last sentence of the explanation.
283	8	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	Oppose	The cultural landscapes and features referred to in the issue are not identified within the Plan.	Undertake consultation and statutory process to amend / include cultural landscapes and features in the Plan
378	14	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	In Part	Issue 18.5.5 should be amended for accuracy, clarity and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	13	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	In Part	Issue 18.5.5 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend issue 18.5.5 as sought in the submission.
451	14	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	In Part	Issue 18.5.5 should be amended for accuracy, clarity and consistency.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
464	15	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	In Part	Issue 18.5.5 needs to acknowledge that landowners may already protect and enhance OLAs and VALs.	Acknowledge landowners for the contributions to protecting and enhancing landscapes that they have made and will continue to make.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	11	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Issue	Issue 18.5.5	Oppose	The Explanation to Issue 18.5.5 refers to 'distinctive' and 'iconic' landscapes. These terms are not defined in the PDP and are not included in s6(a) and (b) of the RMA. Further, it is considered that if landscapes were identified as being 'distinctive' or 'iconic' in the Landscape Technical Report 2010 they would have been identified as an OLA.	Issue 18.5.5 and the accompanying Explanation should be deleted. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
10	1	Whangarei District Council : McGrath, Melissa :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Support	Supports issue 18.5.6 noting an issue of inconsistent identification of outstanding landscapes across territorial boundaries with Whangarei District Council Landscape Review 2005 and the existing provisions of the Whangarei District Plan (does not incorporate 2005 review). The Northland Regional Policy Statement Discussion Document 2010 identifies that a method is to be developed to ensure a consistent approach to identify Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes. A risk exists that Kaipara District Council's methodology used to identify OLAs may differ from that specified within the future Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Seeks retention of issue 18.5.6.
283	9	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Oppose	The approach should be consistent with the Regional Council. Variation 1 is not consistent with the direction of the Regional Policy Statement.	Recognise relevant Regional Council documents such as the RPS and discussion document of the new RPS.
373	6	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Oppose	The issue does not represent a Resource Management issue which can be applied when assessing a Resource Consent.	Delete Issue 18.5.6.
378	15	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	In Part	Issue 18.5.6 should be amended for language clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
395	7	Calveley, C	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Oppose	OLA programme lacks consistency with the adjoining Whangarei District.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[395]	38	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	7	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Oppose	OLA programme lacks consistency with the adjoining Whangarei District.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Issue, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	52	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	14	Hawley, Catherine and John	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	In Part	Issue 18.5.6 needs amending to provide for clarity, accuracy and consistency.	Amend the explanation of issue 18.5.6 as sought in the submission.
451	15	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Issue	Issue 18.5.6	In Part	Issue 18.5.6 should be amended for language clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	3	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Landscape Technical Report 2010	General	N/A	It is considered that the overlay areas in Chapter 4 have not been developed using any recognised criteria for the assessment and determination of natural character and outstanding natural features and landscapes. It is considered that the Landscape Technical Report addresses RMA requirements.	In tandem with Chapter 4 being withdrawn, that Chapter 18 be amended to explicitly state that this Chapter addresses the management of the natural character values of the District including provisions that provide for the preservation of the natural character values of the coastal environment and lake, river, wetland margins from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development and that reference to Overlays be withdrawn from Chapter 18.
397	36	Hawley, Catherine and John	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	Support	Supports methodology used to identify OLAs and VALs in the technical report 2010.	No decision sought.
464	1	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	In Part	The Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report 2010 should be included as a reference document only and not in the main body of text.	Remove all references to the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report 2010 within the body of the chapter and list as a reference document only.
464	16	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	In Part	Additional information and consistency with other Chapters is needed for section 18.8.2.	Remove all references to Kaipara District Technical Landscape Report (2010) in the body of the chapter.
602[464]	5	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	Support	Supports submission 464/16	Allow submission 464/16
484	23	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	In Part	Questions the 'D' rating of OLA 20 for Cultural Associations in the Kaipara District Landscape Assessment worksheet. Notes there may be midden fields towards the south end of the spit near Tern Point.	Amendments to Landscape Assessment worksheet if further investigation shows this as appropriate.
484	24	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Landscape Technical Report 2010	None	In Part	OLA 20 - Mangawhai Barrier Spit is one of the few breeding places for the endangered NZ Fairy Tern.	Amendments to Experiential Values Assessment and in the OLA description if further investigation shows this as appropriate.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	37	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Mapping	General	Support	Supports the inclusion of all OLAs in the Map Series One Land Use Legend and in the Part E, Map Series One: Land Use Maps as being necessary and giving appropriate recognition to OLAs. In particular, OLA 14, 17 and 20 are supported.	No decision sought.
378	38	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Mapping	General	In Part	Map Series One - Map 17: The boundary of OLA 14 should be amended to ensure the integrity of the Brynderwyn Hills landscape.	Re-visit the boundary of OLA 14 taking into consideration the discussion provided by the submitter (increasing area to top of the hill).
451	37	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Mapping	General	Support	Supports the inclusion of all OLAs in the Map Series One Land Use Legend and in the Part E, Map Series One: Land Use Maps as being necessary and giving appropriate recognition to OLAs. In particular, OLA 14, 17 and 20 are supported.	No decision sought.
451	38	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Mapping	General	In Part	Map Series One - Map 17: The boundary of OLA 14 should be amended to ensure the integrity of the Brynderwyn Hills landscape.	Re-visit the boundary of OLA 14 taking into consideration the discussion provided by the submitter (increasing the area to the toe of the hill).
484	11	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Mapping	General	In Part	Difficult to assess whether the area between OLAs 14 and 18 are included in VAL 35 due to lack of detailed planning maps.	The areas between OLAs 14, 18 and VAL 35 should be contiguous with no gaps between the areas.
515	4	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Mapping	General	Oppose	The submitter states that clear, concise descriptions of the OLA's and VAL's have not been given.	No decision sought.
25	26	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The VAL maps in Appendix G are at a small scale and the areas within the VALs are not easily identifiable.	Provide Appendix G maps at a larger scale.
411	4	Birt, Derek	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The submitter requests an amendment to the description of OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve on Planning Map 15.	The submitter seeks that the description of OLA 12 - Pukekohe Hill Reserve on Planning Map 15 is amended to not refer to 'scenic reserve' as their land is privately owned.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
449	5	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
456	5	Jepson, Craig	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
462	5	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
463	14	Kaipara District Council :	Mapping	General corrections	In Part	The submitter states that it would be more logical to have OLA's displayed in Map Series 2, where all other 'special sites, features and units' are shown instead of in their current location, in Map Series 1.	Move the OLA's from Map Series 1 to Map Series 2 and make consequential amendments to any reference of OLA's being in Map Series 1 to Map Series 2.
589[463]	65	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Mapping	General corrections	Support	Supports submission 463/14.	Accept submission 463/14.
465	5	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
467	5	Dugdale, Kenneth	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
484	2	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Mapping	General corrections	In Part	VALs should be shown on detailed maps so that the boundaries of VALs and their relationships with OLAs are clear.	Maps should show VAL boundaries.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
499	1	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Mapping	General corrections	N/A	The submitter states that the OLA's and VAL's need to be accurate and that there should be no 'buffer' around them.	The submitter seeks that the OLA's and VAL's are refined and peer reviewed for accuracy.
589[499]	61	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Mapping	General corrections	Support	Supports submission 499/1.	Accept submission 499/1.
598[499]	1	Stuart, Helen	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/1.	Disallow submission 499/1.
560[499]	4	Stuart, Ian William	Mapping	General corrections	In Part	Supports submission 499/1 in part.	Allow submission 499/1 in part.
501	2	Vincent, Robert Marshall	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	Map scale too small in Appendix G. Unclear if affected.	Delete Variation in entirety.
503	5	Cullen, Shane Noel	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	The boundaries of OLAs and VALs need to be clearly defined. There seems to be discrepancies between the definitions of these features and what is present on the ground.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
522	3	Vallancey, William	Mapping	General corrections	In Part	Comment on the exclusion of Bald Rock, Pukekaroro and the Brynderwyns.	Justification of landscapes mapped.
566[522]	3	Vallancey, William	Mapping	General corrections	Support	Supports submission 522/3	Allow submission 522/3
522	4	Vallancey, William	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	Inaccuracies in maps. Inclusion of pine trees, farmland, gorse etc.	Review landscape areas marked. More detailed mapping.
566[522]	4	Vallancey, William	Mapping	General corrections	Support	Supports submission 522/4	Allow submission 522/4
98	2	Bishop, Julie Maria	Mapping	General corrections	Oppose	Inaccuracy of maps as 2 large lakes have been erased from the map landscape.	Make consequential amendments to relevant planning maps as necessary.
207	3	Paton, A H	Mapping	None	Oppose	Map is inaccurate. Pukekororo Reserve is mapped approximately 3km from where it should be.	Amend map.
604[207]	163	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Mapping	None	Support	Supports submission 207/3	Allow submission 207/3

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
235	9	Forrest, Logan James	Mapping	None	Oppose	The boundary of OLA 21A needs to be clarified as it does not correspond with the Pouto Dune Lakes and their surrounds (including forest).	Appendixes need be amended following more consideration and actual 'ground work'.
283	52	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Mapping	None	N/A	VALs need to be included on the planning maps. Clarify how rules will be applied to development close to identified boundaries.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
314	9	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Mapping	None	Oppose	Maps supplied to farmers are inaccurate and out of date e.g. Landscape Areas 2006 Study - OLA 21 North Head Dune Lakes, one Lake is no longer existent.	Not stated.
371	7	Preston, Alan	Mapping	None	In Part	Clarify boundaries of VAL 35 on map. No gap should exist between VAL 35 and the two OLAs surrounding it.	Include VAL 34 [identified as 35] on a detailed map with boundaries clearly identified,
16	4	Neil, Robyn Patricia	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	Inaccuracies in the scales of the maps taken from aerial photographs. 51 Marine Parade should be excluded from OLA 2. OLA 2 boundary be amended to coincide with the rear boundary of the property. A site visit was undertaken with the Landscape Architect from Council who noted that this property should be excluded from OLA 2.	Amend OLA 2 to exclude 51 Marine Parade.
238	2	Light House Lodge : Budgen, Roy :	Mapping	Specific corrections	Oppose	Inaccurate inclusion of western boundary of property in OLA 22. Lake does not extend into property.	Amend OLA 22 and Appendix 18B.
372	2	Sandford, Alan Paul	Mapping	Specific corrections	N/A	The submitter states that the description and mapping of the proposed Parahi Scenic Reserve are inaccurate as there are no watercourses.	The submitter seeks that the proposed Parahi Scenic Reserve be removed from Chapter 18 until the mapping is made current and accurate.
405	2	Shearer, Craig	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	The submitter seeks amendments to Maps 17 and 53.	The submitter seeks that the OLA's shown in Maps 17 and 53 should stretch one kilometre out to sea as well as extending to the highest landward point in order to protect the coastline from inappropriate use and development.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
602[405]	17	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	Opposes submission 405/2	Disallow submission 405/2
436	1	Croathwaite, Helen Mary	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	The submitter states that the naming of 'Pukearenga Bush' and 'Pukekaroro Bush' is incorrect	The submitter seeks to have Map 2 of 2 (Appendix G - Visual Amenity Landscape Areas) amended to reflect the historical naming of these areas so that 'Pukekaroro Bush' be the area adjacent to the Pukekaroro Mountain and the Pukearenga Bush should be the area adjacent to the Pukearenga Mountain.
484	26	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	Areas of VAL 31 and OLA 16 should be clearly shown on planning maps to show boundaries and areas.	VAL 31 should be shown on a detailed map to show its boundaries.
484	28	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	The area and its boundaries should be clearly shown on a map.	Inclusion of VAL 34 on a detailed planning map to show the area's boundaries.
484	29	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Mapping	Specific corrections	In Part	Boundaries of VAL 35 not clearly shown. There should be no gaps between VAL 35 and two surrounding OLAs.	Inclusion of VAL 35 on a detailed planning map to show the area's boundaries.
505	2	Bryham, Shelley Anne	Mapping	Specific corrections	Oppose	Inaccuracies in mapping and description of VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve.	Delete VAL 21 from Variation until accurate mapping of the area is produced. What compensation is being offered?
505	3	Bryham, Shelley Anne	Mapping	Specific corrections	Oppose	Inaccuracies in mapping and description of VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve.	Delete VAL 21 from Variation until accurate mapping of the area is produced. Council could purchase.
9	1	Templar, Bernard and Jenny	Mapping	Specific corrections	Oppose	Opposes Map 20 as the boundaries are unclear.	The boundary of Map 20 be clarified.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
199	1	Wrightson, Michael	Method	General	Oppose	The process of identifying quality landscape areas is flawed and cannot be relied on.	Abandon Variation until have established a rigorous and robust quality landscape identification process.
231	2	Kelly, June	Method	General	Oppose	Landowners provide stewardship for effective management.	No additional controls are needed.
542	1	Jones, Charlotte	Method	General	Oppose	Subjective identification of OLAs and VALs based on aesthetics.	Delete rules from Variation that are based on aesthetics.
25	21	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Oppose	The use of 'adjacent' areas is opposed as the term is uncertain and open to interpretation.	Delete 'or adjacent to' in Method 18.8.1
283	36	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Oppose	The values referred to in item 2 are not within Appendix 18B. Assessment criteria provision suggests all resource consents must have regard to Appendix 18C.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	37	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Support	If OLAs and VALS are retained in the Plan, items 3 and 4 are supported as a matter of priority.	Retain items 3 and 4 of 18.8.1 District Plan Methods
283	38	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Oppose	Further assessment criteria referred to in items 6 and 7 are subjective, costly and will not provide certainty within the resource consent process.	Only apply assessment criteria to properties within OLAs and VALs.
283	39	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Oppose	Ground-truthing is necessary to determine extents and should have been undertaken prior to notification of the Plan.	Undertake ground-truthing immediately, prior to a hearing and make amendments to the Plan accordingly.
378	29	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	Method 18.8.1 should be amended so that it is clear that Appendix B is a physical description, while the KDLTR details the value of landscapes.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	27	Hawley, Catherine and John	Method	Method 18.8.1	Support	Appendix 18B does not identify the values of landscapes which are provided in the technical report 2010 but provides a physical description. Amendments to the first two methods of 18.8.1 are needed to reflect this.	Amend the first two methods of 18.8.1 with additions and deletions as suggested within the submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	29	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	Method 18.8.1 should be amended so that it is clear that Appendix B is a physical description, while the KDLTR details the value of landscapes.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
453	13	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	The submitter supports in part Method 18.8.1.	The submitter seeks that Method 18.8.1 is amended, to delete reference to VAL's, delete reference to controlling subdivision, delete reference to cultural landscapes and other (as set out in submission).
463	8	Kaipara District Council :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	The submitter states that there needs to be additional assessment of cultural landscapes in areas of significance to Maori in the methods.	The submitter seeks that 18.8.1 is amended to include reference to Treaty Settlement Land: 'Additional assessment of cultural landscapes in areas of significance to Maori and Treaty Settlement Land.'
602[463]	18	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	Opposes in part submission 463/8	Disallow submission 463/8
463	11	Kaipara District Council :	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	The reference to the incorporation of sites included in the Geopreservation Inventory (in OLA's) needs to be clarified.	Amend dash number 11 under 18.8.1 District Plan Methods to include the full reference for the Geopreservation Inventory: 'Kenny, J. and Hayward B., 1996: Inventory and Maps of Important Geological Sites and Landforms in the Northland Region. Geological Society of New Zealand Miscellaneous Publication 83.'
589[463]	66	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Support	Supports submission 463/11.	Accept submission 463/11.
589[463]	71	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Method	Method 18.8.1	Oppose	Opposes submission 463/11.	Reject submission 463/11.
464	14	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Method	Method 18.8.1	In Part	Method 18.8.1 lacks recognition for landowners of VALs and they are inconsistent with other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.	Insert a new method as proposed in the submission and add new methods that are consistent with chapters 17 and 19 of the Proposed District Plan. Remove reference to VALs from point 6 and delete point 7 in its entirety.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	17	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Method	Method 18.8.1	N/A	Method 2 of 18.8.1 should be amended to be consistent with the preceding Objectives and Policies that manage subdivision and development occurring within VALs.	Method 2 of 18.8.1 should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
453	14	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Method	Method 18.8.2	In Part	The submitter is opposed in part to Method 18.8.2.	The submitter seeks that references to VAL's in Method 18.8.2 are deleted.
463	9	Kaipara District Council :	Method	Method 18.8.2	In Part	The submitter states that there need to be an additional method to assess the cultural significance of landscapes to Maori.	The submitter seeks that a new method is added (as the 5th dash under the Methods that Council will provide to assist landowners) as follows: 'Developing a guideline/pamphlet to assist with assessing cultural values in Kaipara landscapes.'
463	10	Kaipara District Council :	Method	Method 18.8.2	In Part	The submitter states that once information has been provided on the cultural significance of a site in a resource consent application, the information could be stored by council for use by future applicants.	The submitter seeks that a new method be inserted as the 6th dash under Methods that the Council will provide to assist landowners, as follows: 'Developing a database of "cultural values of landscapes" by recording information obtained through the processing of consents and progressively mapping this information.'
498	16	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Method	Method 18.8.2	Support	The development of monitoring indicators is supported and NRC offer their assistance.	Add a new method to 18.8 to provide for the development of consultation of key stakeholder. Suggested wording provided.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
118	1	Ball, Bryce Daniel	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	No consultation has been undertaken with the submitter.	Majority decision by rate payers to determine Variation.
560[118]	1	Stuart, Ian William	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Support	Supports submission 118/1	Allow submission 118/1
149	2	Bull, P	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	No direct consultation has been undertaken with most affected stakeholders.	No decision stated.
150	2	Hames, Ken	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	Opposes the lack of clarity and consultation.	A list of landholders affected to be provided and be informed of how landholders are affected.
191	5	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	RMA s32 Report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 has not been received.	Requests hardcopy of s32 Report defining the economic impact of the Variation prior to close of submissions.
191	6	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	Council failed in its statutory obligation to ensure all ratepayers have received all relevant information, denying them an opportunity to submit on a fully informed basis.	Remove VAL 21 - Parahi Scenic Reserve until Council provides clear, current and accurate descriptions of the proposed Parahi Scenic Reserve.
283	112	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	Need for ratepayers and key stakeholders the opportunity to raise their concern.	Withdraw the Plan as notified and re-notify the Plan as a draft.
359	2	Sharp, Richard	Miscellaneous	Consultation	In Part	Request for explanation of shaded blue area in Appendix G overlaying property 42 near Tokatoka Mountain [identified as Sec 101 TN of Tokatoka].	Future applications for use (planting, growing, building) of area shaded blue in OLA 10 [OLA] not to be affected.
379	1	Roadley, Rex	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	Real and effective consultation with directly affected farmers required. Neighbouring farmers need be informed of potential effects.	Withdraw Plan and Variation pending consultation.
380	1	Leaf, Philip Bruce	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	Consultation lacking explaining the implications of the Proposed District Plan on submitter's farming practices.	Withdraw Proposed District Plan in entirety.
383	7	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Miscellaneous	Consultation	In Part	The submitter thinks there should have been more opportunity for consultation.	The submitter thinks there should have been clear options to 'take part' and/or 'have a say' during the review process.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
515	1	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the fact that they were not consulted with on Variation 1 - Landscapes.	No decision sought.
515	6	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	N/A	The submitter states that the OLA's and VAL's are subjective in nature.	The submitter seeks that public meetings are held to determine whether the VAL's and OLA's identified are really outstanding.
518	2	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	N/A	KDC have not contacted the Thomas Coates Estate Trustees directly about the implications of including Chapter 18 on this property, despite information about the property and aggregate resource being presented at the PDP hearing.	No decision sought.
518	3	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Consultation	N/A	Although affected property owners, Thomas Coates Estate Trustees have not received any information from KDC about Variation 1.	No decision sought.
522	1	Vallancey, William	Miscellaneous	Consultation	In Part	Affected landowners require individual consultation.	Consult with affected landowners.
566[522]	1	Vallancey, William	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Support	Supports submission 522/1	Allow submission 522/1
81	3	Stuart, Ian William	Miscellaneous	Consultation	Oppose	The submitter opposes Appendix G - Visual Amenity Landscape Areas	The submitter seeks that the council take part in more consultation with landowners over the matter.
110	2	Hogan, Jonathon	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
137	2	Dalbeth, Valerie	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
141	2	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
142	2	Murray, Reade Patrick	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
143	2	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff, is exclusionary for farming and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
147	2	Engeler, George	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
153	2	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
154	4	Taylor, Joan Eva	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
166	2	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
169	2	Mulherm, M E	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
170	2	Hadlow, C L	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
171	2	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
173	2	Sills, Val Winston	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
174	4	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
176	2	Jones, Graham Laurence	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
177	3	Awhitu, Lucy	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
185	3	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
190	4	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought.
192	1	Foster, William Rowand	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The current District Plan renders the Variation an unnecessary expense.	Abandon the Variation.
205	3	Paton, Barry	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Economic costs will incur from land notated in OLAs and VALs (including the loss of rates if land is taken).	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[205]	312	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Support	Supports submission 205/3	Allow submission 205/3
229	2	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
235	2	Forrest, Logan James	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
239	3	Russell, Keith Ernest	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
245	4	Legarth, Larson	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. OLAs single out landowners at huge costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
246	3	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
259	2	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought.
259	9	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Opposes the cost to landowners of badly managed funds and bills that the Council generates.	No decision sought.
263	2	Draper, William	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
264	2	Fernandez, Jenni	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
273	2	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
274	2	Poole, Raymond George	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
276	2	Robinson, Perrin	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
278	2	Miller, James Wynard	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
279	2	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
280	2	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
281	2	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
282	2	Kaipara Citizens and Ratepayers Association : Mortensen, Allan :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
284	2	Andrew, L J and N E	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
285	2	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
286	5	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought.
287	2	MacLean, Angus	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
288	2	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
289	2	Guest, W J and N M	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
293	2	Lulich, Leonard S	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
294	2	Williamson, Robert John	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
295	2	Brown, Stuart WJ	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
296	2	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
612[296]	2	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/2.	Disallow submission 296/2.
297	2	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
298	2	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
299	3	Combe Head Farms : Morshead, Pamela :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The existing Plan's rules and regulations protect the environment and ensure positive growth. The Variation will increase compliance costs to the ratepayer. Consultancy costs are too high.	Not stated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
300	2	Stopher, Allan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
301	2	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
302	2	Howard, Marie Hazel	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
303	2	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
304	2	Sapiatzer, Peter	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
305	2	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
306	2	Walker, John and Sjannie	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
307	2	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
308	2	Bull, Josphe Arthur	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
309	2	Ulrich, Lorraine Tereza	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
310	2	Savage, Keith and Velma	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
311	2	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
312	2	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
313	2	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
314	2	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
316	2	Hardy, Isabell	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
317	2	House, Stuart Henderson	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
318	2	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
319	2	Otway, Brian Kay	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
320	2	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
321	2	Smith, Kevin and Merilyn	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
322	2	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
323	2	Kemp, Harry	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
324	2	Subritzky, Desmond	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
326	2	Appleton, Gordon George	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
327	2	Bennett, Kawyn	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
328	2	Reed, Douglas	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
329	2	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
3	2	Sellars, Chris	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
330	2	Taurua, Bernice	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
331	2	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
332	2	Ludvigson, Tanya	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. High rates return nothing to ratepayers but more restrictions.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
335	2	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
336	2	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
337	2	Ruiterman, A T	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
338	2	Linton, David	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
339	2	Davies, Rhys John	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
341	2	Ballantyne, I K	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
342	2	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. Planning and enforcement of Variation 1 will result in huge costs. Encouraging economic should be a priority. Should be encourage activities of industry and tourism, not restricting them.	No decision sought
343	2	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
345	2	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
347	2	Gatti, Susan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
348	2	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
349	2	Williams, Murray	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
350	2	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
351	2	Lees, Tom	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
352	2	Donegan, Julia	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
353	2	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
354	2	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. Council should apply common sense.	No decision sought
355	2	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
356	2	Appleton, Lester Winston	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
357	2	Reid, R T S	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
358	2	He, Lisa	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
361	2	Lusty, David James	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
362	2	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
363	2	Vallance, John And Cathy	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
364	2	Warnes, Stuart	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
365	2	Wood, Steven and Susan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
366	2	McEvoy, R J and A	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
367	2	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
368	2	Robinson, Asa	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
369	2	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
370	2	Brown, Aland and Judith	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
381	2	Ward, Allison Anne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
384	2	McGillivray, Andrew and Christine	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Chapter 18 will result in an expensive bureaucracy.	Exclude private property from OLAs. Remove all references VALs from the Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
387	2	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
388	2	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
389	2	Malam, Anne Marie	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
392	2	Anderson, Audrey	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
394	2	Borger, Bert	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	High costs of compliance with Variation as consents are required. Impacts on farming and forestry.	Delete VAL 19 from Appendix G.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
399	2	Ward, Chris	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. KDC is in \$84million debt. The ratepayers cannot afford consultancy and administration of large areas of DOC controlled OLAs and VALs.	Withdraw Variation and review the current Kaipara District Plan.
404	2	Sidwell, Craig	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
414	2	Green, Donna	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
416	2	Blitvic, Dwayne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
418	4	Wills, Edward	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
422	2	Blitvic, Elaine	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
424	2	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
428	2	Hooker, Gary	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
430	3	Fish, Isabel	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
439	2	Anderson, Innes McRae	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
440	2	Blitvic, Ivan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
443	2	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
458	12	Anderson, John	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to extra costs borne by property developers as a result of Variation 1 - Landscapes.	The submitter seeks that the land restrictions are relaxed in proposed Variation 1 - Landscapes and that the only increase in expenses for citizens are rates adjusted for the annual rate of inflation.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
459	9	Bull, John R L	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The cost and complexity of trying to comply with the rules of the variation will prohibit development and result in the decline in Council income.	Withdraw the variation.
469	2	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
477	2	Davey, Louanne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
483	2	Baines, Martin Hamer	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
489	3	Hayes, Michael Walter	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Variation will result in high costs to the Council and to ratepayers.	Physically view the landscapes to be protected. Overlays should be deleted from some of these landscapes.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
491	2	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
502	2	Halse, Robyne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs. Rates are already too high - this is robbery.	No decision sought
504	2	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
506	2	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
510	2	Fish, Terence Henry	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
514	2	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
521	2	Ward, Wayne	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Introduction of OLAs on Department of Conservation land will impose unreasonable costs on ratepayers. Council will have to employ more staff resulting in an even greater rates burden.	Withdraw the Plan and renotify as a draft plan or review the plan for the current.
526	5	Goulding, Timothy	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
539	3	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	High cost to ratepayers.	Cancel changes that restrict and cost ratepayers more.
558[539]	3	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Opposes submission 539/3.	Disallow submission 539/3.
540	2	Allen, Kevin Eric	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	High costs to KDC ratepayers.	Leave alone.
557[540]	2	Allen, Kevin Eric	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Opposes submission 540/2.	Disallow submission 540/2.
541	2	Findley, Christine	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Council revenue collecting at a cost to ratepayers and to the detriment of growth.	Leave rules as they were.
559[541]	2	Findley, Christine	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	Opposes submission 541/2	Disallow submission 541/2

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
553	2	Paterson, CR and CL	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
555	2	Carter, W M	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
70	6	Smith, Edward John	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
8	3	Underwood, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
604[8]	236	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Cost	Support	Supports submission 8/3	Allow submission 8/3

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
92	4	Bishop, Robert Alan	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought.
96	2	Russell, Ian	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
97	3	Hindrup, Ray	Miscellaneous	Cost	Oppose	The management of private land should be left to landowners. There are enough rules and regulations in the existing District Plan to protect the environment and ensure positive growth for the Kaipara District. Do not want a District Plan which requires the Council to employ more monitoring staff and increase compliance costs.	No decision sought
575[202]	19	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 202/3.	Submission 202/3 be disallowed.
110	7	Hogan, Jonathon	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
137	7	Dalbeth, Valerie	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
141	7	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
141	9	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter believes the council does not have the required funds to finance the proposals in Variation 1	The submitter requests that the council focus on its own responsibilities, particularly roading projects
142	7	Murray, Reade Patrick	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
143	7	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
146	1	Booth, Margaret Ann	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	N/A	Requests more information on whether their forest replanting will be affected by Variation 1 - Landscapes.	Not stated
147	7	Engeler, George	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
153	7	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
154	2	Taylor, Joan Eva	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter seeks that there be fewer restrictions for what farmers can do on their own private land	The submitter seeks that the council act on behalf of the farmers because they voted the council in.
154	9	Taylor, Joan Eva	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
166	7	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
169	7	Mulherm, M E	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
170	7	Hadlow, C L	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
171	7	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
173	7	Sills, Val Winston	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
174	9	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
177	8	Awhitu, Lucy	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
177	10	Awhitu, Lucy	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Money would be better spent on road maintenance.	Not stated.
185	8	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
190	9	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
196	3	O'Connor, Helen Beatrice	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Northern face of Pukekaroro Reserve and State Highway One were established on Coates property. Land remaining is inheritance and will be lost with the Variation.	Not stated.
604[196]	309	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	Supports submission 196/3	Allow submission 196/3
202	4	Taylor, Leslie James	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter opposes OLA 14.	The submitter seeks that compensation is paid to those landowners in OLA 14 who feel that their property values have been impaired
229	7	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
230	1	Williams, Laurence Kennedy	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Councils that make submissions against our farm should pay their share of rates.	Councils that make submissions against our farm should pay their share of rates.
235	7	Forrest, Logan James	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
236	2	New Zealand Historic Places Trust : Reynolds, Sherry :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	NZHPT can assist council when heritage values are involved.	Mechanisms be provided to NZHPT to participate as an affected party. NZHPT work in partnership with KDC in future regarding heritage values.
239	8	Russell, Keith Ernest	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
245	9	Legarth, Larson	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
246	8	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
259	7	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
263	7	Draper, William	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
264	7	Fernandez, Jenni	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
273	7	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
274	7	Poole, Raymond George	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
276	7	Robinson, Perrin	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
278	7	Miller, James Wynard	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
279	7	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
280	7	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
281	7	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
284	7	Andrew, L J and N E	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
285	7	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
286	10	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
287	7	MacLean, Angus	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
288	7	Jefts Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
289	7	Guest, W J and N M	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
291	1	McShane, Owen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	N/A	The submitter thinks the submission form should have referred to methods and objectives.	The submission form should have been written clearer to include methods and objectives in the provision description.
291	2	McShane, Owen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that the letter that accompanied the submission form contained many errors and was misleading.	No decision sought
291	6	McShane, Owen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the text: 'I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission' on the submission forms.	The submitter seeks a rewording of the text used on the submission forms.
291	7	McShane, Owen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the text: 'I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that' on the submission forms.	The submitter seeks that the text: 'I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that' is reworded to be clearer.
293	7	Lulich, Leonard S	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
294	7	Williamson, Robert John	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
295	7	Brown, Stuart WJ	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
296	7	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
612[296]	7	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/7.	Disallow submission 296/7.
297	7	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
298	7	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
300	7	Stopher, Allan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
301	7	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
302	7	Howard, Marie Hazel	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
303	7	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
304	7	Sapiatzer, Peter	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
305	7	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
305	9	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The Council democratically elected have adopted a draconian attitude with this Variation. It is not fair nor representative.	Not stated.
306	7	Walker, John and Sjannie	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
307	7	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
308	7	Bull, Josphe Arthur	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
309	7	Ulrich, Lorraine Tereza	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
310	7	Savage, Keith and Velma	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
311	7	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
312	7	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
313	7	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
314	7	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
315	4	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that Council have allowed late submissions previously and thinks they should extend the time period for submissions in this case.	The submitter seeks that the time period for submissions should be extended to 31 March 2011.
315	5	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that the required Section 32 report has not been sent to them.	The submitter seeks that the Section 32 report is sent to them prior to the close of submissions
315	6	Painanui Farm Ltd : Thompson, Paul :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that Variation 1 - Landscapes has not been easily accessible for the majority of Kaipara citizens to engage with.	No decision sought
316	7	Hardy, Isabell	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
317	7	House, Stuart Henderson	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
318	7	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
319	7	Otway, Brian Kay	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
320	7	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
321	7	Smith, Kevin and Marilyn	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
322	7	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
323	7	Kemp, Harry	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
324	7	Subritzky, Desmond	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
326	7	Appleton, Gordon George	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
327	7	Bennett, Kawyn	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
328	7	Reed, Douglas	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
329	7	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
3	7	Sellers, Chris	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
330	7	Taurua, Bernice	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
331	7	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
332	7	Ludvigson, Tanya	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
335	7	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
335	9	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Council insists on controlling land with resource consents and costs and native bush has deteriorated in the last sixty years. Landowners should be assisted in managing their land including from pests and weeds etc., and not restricted from doing so.	Not stated.
336	7	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
337	7	Ruiterman, A T	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
338	7	Linton, David	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
339	7	Davies, Rhys John	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
341	7	Ballantyne, I K	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
342	7	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
343	7	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
345	7	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
347	7	Gatti, Susan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
348	7	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
349	7	Williams, Murray	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
350	7	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
351	7	Lees, Tom	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
352	7	Donegan, Julia	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
353	7	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
353	9	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Council failed in their obligations to improve the area and instil in ratepayers assurance that council is cooperative. Council's stand over tactics may be resisted.	Not stated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
354	7	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
355	7	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
356	7	Appleton, Lester Winston	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
357	7	Reid, R T S	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
358	7	He, Lisa	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
361	7	Lusty, David James	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
362	7	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
363	7	Vallance, John And Cathy	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
364	7	Warnes, Stuart	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
365	7	Wood, Steven and Susan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
366	7	McEvoy, R J and A	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
367	7	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
368	7	Robinson, Asa	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
369	7	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
370	7	Brown, Aland and Judith	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
372	1	Sandford, Alan Paul	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that the council is unsure of whether bush on their land is included in Variation 1 - Landscapes after ringing to check.	No decision sought.
381	7	Ward, Allison Anne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
383	10	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	In Part	The submitter thinks it would be better for government agencies to work together more.	The submitter seeks that the Crown, DoC, Northland Regional Council and Kaipara District Council should 'communicate' and 'work together more'.
387	7	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
388	7	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
389	7	Malam, Anne Marie	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
392	7	Anderson, Audrey	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
398	2	Waring, Chris and Lorrain	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Remove ex Councillors and commissioners.	Remove CEO from office.
399	7	Ward, Chris	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us. Nor does it include costs to community of process.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
399	9	Ward, Chris	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Crown Land has been identified as OLAs and VALs without prior mineral exploration. This will deny future access to potential mineral resources and limit future economic growth. E.g. the Mangatipa Feature controlled by DOC, is known to contain copper deposits.	Not stated.
404	7	Sidwell, Craig	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
414	7	Green, Donna	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
416	7	Blitvic, Dwayne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
418	2	Wills, Edward	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	The submitter supports the total exclusion of private property in Appendix 18B	The submitter seeks that where there are identified OLA's that are not already council owned, Council should have to purchase said land.
418	9	Wills, Edward	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
422	7	Blitvic, Elaine	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
424	7	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
428	7	Hooker, Gary	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
430	8	Fish, Isabel	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
431	1	Crawshaw, Graham	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	N/A	The submitter states that they have preserved the native bush on their land voluntarily.	The submitter seeks the cancellation of rates being charged on the 45 acres of native bush on their property.
438	3	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that Variation 1 - Landscapes is contrary to the terms and conditions set out in the Pouto Topu A Trust Order.	No decision sought.
589[438]	15	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
439	7	Anderson, Innes McRae	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
440	7	Blitvic, Ivan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
441	1	Dennis, Jane Lee	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	In relation to Appendix 18C - Additional Assessment Criteria, the submitter believes it is unfair to apply specific criteria to private blocks.	The submitter seeks the use or amendment of existing bylaws to cover all of Kaipara, not specific areas.
442	8	Forde, Jeanette	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions	The submitter seeks that council staff are educated to ensure staff follow the guidelines of council
599[442]	9	Stuart, Helen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	Supports submission 442/8.	Allow submission 442/8.
443	7	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
443	9	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter does not feel that there has been enough time or information allocated to make an informed decision	No decision sought
443	10	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter believes too much money has been spent on consultant's fees in general by Council.	The submitter seeks that less money be spent on consultants
448	2	Stevens, Gary	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	The submitter states that it is unfair to single out particular private blocks and apply specific criteria to them.	The submitter seeks that Council use or amend existing bylaws to cover all of Kaipara, not specific areas.
458	13	Anderson, John	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	N/A	The submitter is opposed to Kaipara Districts general lack of economic and population growth.	The submitter seeks that Council develop a business plan to promote population and economic growth.
469	7	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
477	7	Davey, Louanne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
483	7	Baines, Martin Hamer	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
484	33	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	In Part	Site visits should be mandatory as part of resource consent processing.	No decision sought
491	7	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
496	2	Historic Places Trust, NZ	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	NZHPT can assist council when heritage values are involved.	Mechanisms be provided to NZHPT to participate as an affected party. NZHPT work in partnership with KDC in future regarding heritage values.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
502	7	Halse, Robyne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
504	7	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
506	7	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
510	7	Fish, Terence Henry	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
514	7	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
526	10	Goulding, Timothy	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
532	1	Berghan, Gayleen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Not enough information received.	Council to 'mind their own business'.
539	1	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Variation poorly researched and confusingly drafted.	Cancel changes that restrict and cost ratepayers more.
558[539]	1	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Opposes submission 539/1.	Disallow submission 539/1.
539	4	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	KDC to serve the public not to practice full control.	Rely on existing rules; view each application for development individually regarding the environment.
558[539]	4	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Opposes submissions 539/4.	Disallow submission 539/4.
540	4	Allen, Kevin Eric	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Council hindering growth and to maintain role as service provider not a 'self-governing out of control entity'.	Leave system as it is.
557[540]	4	Allen, Kevin Eric	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	Opposes submission 540/4.	Disallow submission 540/4.
553	7	Paterson, CR and CL	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
555	7	Carter, W M	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
70	11	Smith, Edward John	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
8	8	Underwood, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
604[8]	241	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Support	Supports submission 8/8	Allow submission 8/8
92	9	Bishop, Robert Alan	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
96	7	Russell, Ian	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
97	8	Hindrup, Ray	Miscellaneous	Matter outside RMA	Oppose	A s32 report defining the economic impact of Variation 1 on my/our property has not been sent to us.	Requests copy of s32 report prior to close of submissions.
143	9	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	The submitter believes that all landowners should be consulted with appropriately from the council	The submitter requests that all landowners are approached personally if they are unable to attend a public meeting
202	3	Taylor, Leslie James	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	The submitter opposes OLA 14.	The submitter seeks that the classification of OLA 14 is done in conjunction with Whangarei District Council to 'harmonise' the OLA with the Whangarei District Plan.
576[202]	19	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Oppose submission 202/3	Disallow submission 202/3
303	10	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Government intervention is not the best method as it has a history of poor outcomes.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
430	10	Fish, Isabel	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	The submitter states that they need to be able to clear access tracks of regrowth in order for fire trucks and Northpower trucks to have access	No decision sought
4	3	Biddles, Christopher	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Opposes the council designating a much larger area as a natural feature of significance when the covenanted wetland areas are only approximately 8.5ha.	Changes be made to the district plan in this process, to limit the area of the "designation" at West Coast Ocean Beach to that which is covenanted.
459	10	Bull, John R L	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Council should produce a business plan to set out the population and business development required for the district to keep up with the country, and from that a proposed district plan should be created to enable the business plan objectives to be achieved.	Produce a business plan to inform a proposed district plan.
484	34	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	In Part	Submitter refers to previous submission on PDP, where it was noted that the sections relation to heritage and culture were poorly developed. Submission notes that for Appendix 18 C (e) to be meaningful these sections of the District Plan need to be further developed.	Review and update the heritage and culture sections of the District Plan.
493	6	Alispahic, Natalie	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Insufficient work has been completed by Council in relation to this matter. Further work is required to complete the Council's assessment.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing is completed.
499	3	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	The submitter states that Chapter 4 of the proposed plan 'Overlays' has not been developed using the recognised criteria for the assessment and determination of natural character and are largely superseded by the Chapter 18 OLA's and VAL's.	The submitter seeks that Chapter 4 'Overlays' should be removed.
589[499]	62	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Support	Supports submission 499/3.	Accept submission 499/3.
602[499]	19	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Support	Supports submission 499/3	Allow submission 499/3

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
598[499]	3	Stuart, Helen	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/3.	Disallow submission 499/3.
528	1	Ellis, Rhonda	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Disagree with Chapter 12 - Rural of the District Plan.	Council purchase affected land.
528	2	Ellis, Rhonda	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	Oppose	Resource consenting is expensive and time consuming.	Not stated.
6	1	Biddles, Richard and Vivienne	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	In Part	Opposes the council designating a much larger area as a natural feature of significance when the covenanted wetland areas are only approximately 8.5ha.	Changes be made to the district plan in this process, to limit the area of the designation to that which is covenanted. A map has been provided by the submitter.
67	3	Investments, Poutu	Miscellaneous	Matter outside scope of variation	N/A	Original Submission to Proposed Plan submitted.	Not stated.
149	3	Bull, P	Miscellaneous	Section 32	Oppose	The Section 32 analysis does not consider costs involved with meeting the Variation requirements. The analysis references to Section 5 mention everyone except those most affected.	No decision stated.
283	111	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Section 32	Oppose	The Section 32 analysis is inadequate; it has not adequately assessed the true economic implications associated with the Introduction of Chapter 18.	None specified
458	15	Anderson, John	Miscellaneous	Section 32	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the S32 Analysis not examining the benefits and costs of the proposed plan.	The submitter seeks that Proposed Variation 1 - Landscapes is withdrawn.
459	13	Bull, John R L	Miscellaneous	Section 32	Oppose	The s32 analysis does not examine the cost side of the Plan.	The Plan should be withdrawn if the s32 report has not been undertaken correctly.
518	5	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Section 32	N/A	Section 32 evaluation fails to provide a sounds cost / benefit analysis of the incorporation of each OLA into the PDP. The economic evaluation has been undertaken on a district wide scale, and has not considered the economic implications specific to this OLA.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
515	2	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Miscellaneous	Section 5	Oppose	The submitter opposes the failure to take into account Maori cultural and spiritual interests as prescribed by Sections 5, 6(e), 7(a) and 8 of the RMA.	The submitter seeks that Maori cultural and spiritual interests are included in Variation 1 - Landscapes.
453	1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Miscellaneous	Section 6	In Part	The submitter states that the proposed district plan needs to be consistent with Section 6(b) of the RMA that sets out that only landscapes and features that are considered to have a high level of naturalness and outstanding qualities are to be protected.	The submitter seeks that only natural features and natural landscapes that have demonstrable outstanding and natural qualities are identified and mapped.
371	2	Preston, Alan	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Support OLA 18, but spelling incorrect.	Correct spelling of 'precipitous' in paragraph one of the description of OLA 18.
371	4	Preston, Alan	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Support OLA 19, but spelling incorrect and inconsistent.	Amend name of OLA19 to read Sentinel Rock Coast and name on Maps 17 and 53 of 60 to read Sentinel Rock Coast (not Sentinel Rock Sandy Coast).
397	2	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Amendments are needed to section 18.1 for accuracy and clarity.	Amend section 18.1 paragraphs 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 as set out in the submission.
397	6	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Section 18.2 needs amendment for grammar, clarity and accuracy.	Amend paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of section 18.2 as supplied within the submission.
397	8	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Section 18.4 needs amendment for clarity and accuracy.	Amend section 18.4 as supplied in the submission.
464	2	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	There is no section 18.3.	Correct numbering to reflect the missing section 18.3.
464	18	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Outcomes are numbered incorrectly.	Outcomes to be renumbered.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
484	3	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Chapter 18.1, (third paragraph under VAL subheading) refers to Appendices D. It is assumed this should refer to Appendix C.	Amendments to accurately reflect which appendix is being referred to.
484	5	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Typographical error in 18.1 (paragraph 2 under VAL subheading). Additional word 'the'.	Amendments to ensure text grammatically correct.
484	16	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Inconsistent name. The name of OLA 18 'Bream Tail Coast' is referred to as Bream Tail Rocky Coast on Map 17 of 60.	Name of OLA 18 should consistently be 'Bream Tail Coast' throughout the Variation.
484	17	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Spelling error in description of OLA 18. 'Precititous' should read 'precipitous'.	'Precititous' should be changed to 'precipitous'.
484	20	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Spelling error in OLA 19 Appendix 18B - should be spelt 'Sentinel'	'Sentinal' should be replaced with 'sentinel'.
484	21	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Typographical error - Maps 17 and 53 refer to 'Sentinel Rock Sandy Coast'. It should say 'Sentinel Rock Coast'.	'Sentinel Rock Sandy Coast' should be changed to 'Sentinel Rock Coast'.
486	19	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Miscellaneous	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	N/A	The sequential numbering of Outcomes 19.1.1 and 19.1.2 should be corrected to 18.1.1 and 18.1.2.	The sequential numbering of Outcomes 19.1.1 and 19.1.2 should be corrected to 18.1.1 and 18.1.2.
397	1	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Structural	Support	The separation of rules relating to Chapter 18 makes it more difficult to follow and understand.	Chapter 18 should be complete with its own rules rather than scattered throughout the Plan.
397	7	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Structural	In Part	There is no section 18.3.	Renumber the variation.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
405	3	Shearer, Craig	Miscellaneous	Structural	In Part	The submitter seeks amendment to the introduction of Chapter 18.	The submitter seeks that Chapter 18's introduction be amended from: 'Outstanding Landscape Areas are deemed to be those landscape areas and landscape features which strongly display all of the key physical characteristics and character associated with a particular landscape type, including how the landscape is experienced (as identified in Appendix 18A) and are prominent in the landscape, lending it a sense of spectacle and area with a minimum level of built development or modification.' To read as follows: 'Outstanding Landscape Areas are deemed to be those landscape areas and landscape features, including as viewed from the coastal marine area, which strongly display all of the key physical characteristics and character associated with a particular landscape type, including how the landscape is experienced (as identified in Appendix 18A) and are prominent in the landscape, lending it a sense of spectacle and area with a minimum level of built development or modification.'
463	1	Kaipara District Council :	Miscellaneous	Structural	In Part	The submitter outlines a change required to Figure 1.2 - How to Use the District Plan.	The submitter seeks that the reference to 'Outstanding Landscape Area (OLA)' is moved from under Overlays and is included in the list of Special sites, features and units. A similar amendment will also need to be made to Figure 2.1 District Plan Mapping Structure.
589[463]	67	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Structural	Support	Supports submission 463/1.	Accept submission 463/1.
371	1	Preston, Alan	Miscellaneous	Terminology	In Part	Support OLA 18, but spelling inconsistent in the Appendix 18B on Map 17 of 60.	Name OLA 18 Bream Tail Coast throughout the Variation including Appendix 18B on Map 17 of 60.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	39	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports amendments to Figure 1-2 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to OLAs.	No decision sought.
378	40	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports inclusion of OLAs in Chapter 2 [Figure 2-1] with minor amendment.	Amend Chapter 2 text to add 'and Areas' after 'Overlays'.
397	47	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Terminology	In Part	Appendix G contents states 'Visual Amenity Landscape Areas'. This is consistent with the rest of the variation which states 'Visual Amenity Landscapes'.	Remove the word 'Areas' from Appendix G map titles and use 'Visual Amenity Landscapes' instead.
397	49	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports amendments to Figure 1-2 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to OLAs.	No decision sought.
397	50	Hawley, Catherine and John	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports inclusion of OLAs in Chapter 2 [Figure 2-1] with minor amendment.	Amend Chapter 2 text to add 'and Areas' after 'Overlays'.
451	39	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports amendments to Figure 1-2 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to OLAs.	No decision sought.
451	40	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports inclusion of OLAs in Chapter 2 [Figure 2-1] with minor amendment.	Amend Chapter 2 text to add 'and Areas' after 'Overlays'.
589[453]	79	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Support	Supports submission 453/1.	Accept submission 453/1.
453	2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Miscellaneous	Terminology	In Part	The submitter states that the term 'Outstanding Landscapes needs to be amended.	The submitter seeks that the term 'Outstanding Landscapes' is amended to: 'Outstanding Natural Landscapes'.
464	28	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Miscellaneous	Terminology	In Part	Figure 12-3c is not consistent with other figures.	Format Figure 12-3c to be consistent with Figure 12-1 and 12-2.
525	3	Bowring, Ian and Glenda	Miscellaneous	Terminology	Oppose	VAL is not a term defined in the RMA.	Remove VAL from Lot 1 DP 197211.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
110	6	Hogan, Jonathon	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
110	11	Hogan, Jonathon	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	The submitter is not satisfied with the amount of time allocated to make a submission on Appendix G - 8 days from receiving the letter to having it completed.	The submitter seeks that the council extend the time period for submissions to 40 days
137	6	Dalbeth, Valerie	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
141	6	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
142	6	Murray, Reade Patrick	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
143	6	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
147	6	Engeler, George	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
150	1	Hames, Ken	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes the amount of time allocated for landowners to make a submission.	Extend the time period for submitting for two additional months.
153	6	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
154	8	Taylor, Joan Eva	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
166	6	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
169	6	Mulherm, M E	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
170	6	Hadlow, C L	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
171	6	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
173	6	Sills, Val Winston	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
174	8	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
176	6	Jones, Graham Laurence	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
177	7	Awhitu, Lucy	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
185	7	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
190	8	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
191	4	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Miscellaneous	Timing	N/A	Extend the timeframe to submit on the Variation. The Council did allow late submissions on the District Plan and the cost is great to ratepayers in preparing the Plan and Variation, entitling them to more time to respond.	Extend submission deadline to 31 March 2011.
229	6	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
235	6	Forrest, Logan James	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
239	7	Russell, Keith Ernest	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
245	8	Legarth, Larson	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
246	7	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
259	6	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
263	6	Draper, William	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
264	6	Fernandez, Jenni	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
273	6	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
274	6	Poole, Raymond George	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
276	6	Robinson, Perrin	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
278	6	Miller, James Wynard	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
279	6	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
280	6	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
281	6	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
282	4	Kaipara Citizens and Ratepayers Association : Mortensen, Allan :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
284	6	Andrew, L J and N E	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
285	6	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
286	9	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
287	6	MacLean, Angus	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
288	6	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
289	6	Guest, W J and N M	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
293	6	Lulich, Leonard S	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
294	6	Williamson, Robert John	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
295	6	Brown, Stuart WJ	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
296	6	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
612[296]	6	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/6.	Disallow submission 296/6.
297	6	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
298	6	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
300	6	Stopher, Allan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
301	6	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
302	6	Howard, Marie Hazel	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
303	6	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
304	6	Sapiatzer, Peter	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
305	6	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
306	6	Walker, John and Sjannie	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
307	6	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
308	6	Bull, Josphe Arthur	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
309	6	Urlich, Lorraine Tereza	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
310	6	Savage, Keith and Velma	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
311	6	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
312	6	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
313	6	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
314	6	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
316	6	Hardy, Isabell	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
317	6	House, Stuart Henderson	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
318	6	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
319	6	Otway, Brian Kay	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
320	6	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
321	6	Smith, Kevin and Merilyn	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
322	6	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
323	6	Kemp, Harry	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
324	6	Subritzky, Desmond	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
326	6	Appleton, Gordon George	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
327	6	Bennett, Kawyn	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
328	6	Reed, Douglas	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
329	6	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
3	6	Sellars, Chris	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
330	6	Taurua, Bernice	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
331	6	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
332	6	Ludvigson, Tanya	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
335	6	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
336	6	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
337	6	Ruiterman, A T	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
338	6	Linton, David	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
339	6	Davies, Rhys John	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
340	1	Fisher, P R	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Insufficient time to submit.	Extend submission deadline to total 6 months.
341	6	Ballantyne, I K	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
342	6	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
343	6	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
345	6	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
347	6	Gatti, Susan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
348	6	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
349	6	Williams, Murray	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
350	6	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
351	6	Lees, Tom	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
352	6	Donegan, Julia	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
353	6	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
354	6	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
355	6	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
356	6	Appleton, Lester Winston	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
357	6	Reid, R T S	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
358	6	He, Lisa	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
361	6	Lusty, David James	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
362	6	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
363	6	Vallance, John And Cathy	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
364	6	Warnes, Stuart	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
365	6	Wood, Steven and Susan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
366	6	McEvoy, R J and A	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
367	6	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
368	6	Robinson, Asa	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
369	6	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
370	6	Brown, Aland and Judith	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
381	6	Ward, Allison Anne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
383	9	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	The submitter states that some of the affected landowners had not received aerial maps until February 2011, giving insufficient time to present a submission.	No decision sought.
387	6	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
388	6	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
389	6	Malam, Anne Marie	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
390	4	Heywood, Anne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Insufficient time and information to prepare submission.	Delete the Variation in entirety, or remove Baylys Beach from OLA 2, or remove settlement areas in identified gorges from OLA 2.
391	1	Hargreaves, Anthony and Lindsey	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Comment on lack of time to consult information.	Not stated.
392	6	Anderson, Audrey	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
399	6	Ward, Chris	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
404	6	Sidwell, Craig	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
407	15	Nickolson, Dave	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Council has failed to consult with all affected parties. Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Extend the timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
407	19	Nickolson, Dave	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
414	6	Green, Donna	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
416	6	Blitvic, Dwayne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
418	8	Wills, Edward	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
422	6	Blitvic, Elaine	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
424	6	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
428	6	Hooker, Gary	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
430	7	Fish, Isabel	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
439	6	Anderson, Innes McRae	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
440	6	Blitvic, Ivan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
443	6	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
449	4	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
449	7	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.
450	15	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Council has failed to consult with all affected parties. Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Extend the timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
450	19	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
452	3	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Support	Agrees with Variation's explanatory statement that further work is required over time to achieve statutory obligations.	Acknowledge the need for further identification of landscape values. Additions to objectives, policies and methods are sought.
589[452]	78	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes submission 452/3.	Reject submission 452/3.
456	4	Jepson, Craig	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
456	7	Jepson, Craig	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
459	12	Bull, John R L	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	The proposed district plan is costing more than expected and should not have been started until after changes to the RPS, NZCPS and RMA amendments have been completed.	Process should continue after changes to the RPS, NZCPS and RMA amendments have been completed.
462	4	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
462	7	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.
465	4	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
465	7	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.
467	4	Dugdale, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
467	7	Dugdale, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.
469	6	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
477	6	Davey, Louanne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
483	6	Baines, Martin Hamer	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
485	4	Chick, Melanie and Alden	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Lack of time to prepare - 10 days since receiving information to submission due date.	Not stated.
491	6	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
492	15	Grierson, Monique	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Council has failed to consult with all affected parties. Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Extend the timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
492	19	Grierson, Monique	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.
493	5	Alispahic, Natalie	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Council has failed to consult with all affected parties and additional information was given only 12 working days prior to the close of submissions.	Extend the timeframes for receiving submissions until 28 March 2011.
501	1	Vincent, Robert Marshall	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Notification not received until 19/2/2011. Insufficient time to submit.	Delete Variation in entirety.
502	6	Halse, Robyne	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
503	4	Cullen, Shane Noel	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	More work (as outlined in the Chapter 18 document) is required to provide certainty to ratepayers and landowners as to the implications of Variation 1.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work is completed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
503	7	Cullen, Shane Noel	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Conflicting information has been supplied by Council with the most recent only 12 working days prior to close of submissions. The Council is in breach of its statutory obligations under the RMA.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 28 March 2011.
504	6	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
506	6	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
510	6	Fish, Terence Henry	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
514	6	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
515	10	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	The submitter states that there was insufficient time allocated for making submissions.	The submitter seeks that the submission period is extended until 31 March 2011.
526	9	Goulding, Timothy	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
539	2	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Lack of time to prepare.	Cancel changes that restrict and cost ratepayers more.
558[539]	2	Findley, Paul	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes submission 539/2.	Disallow submission 539/2.
553	6	Paterson, CR and CL	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
555	6	Carter, W M	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
70	10	Smith, Edward John	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
8	7	Underwood, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
604[8]	240	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Timing	Support	Supports submission 8/7	Allow submission 8/7

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
92	8	Bishop, Robert Alan	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1.	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
96	6	Russell, Ian	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
97	7	Hindrup, Ray	Miscellaneous	Timing	Oppose	Opposes having two weeks to respond in a submission to Variation 1	Seeks extension of timeframe for making submissions to 31 March 2011.
110	8	Hogan, Jonathon	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
137	8	Dalbeth, Valerie	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
141	8	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	[No decision sought.]
142	8	Murray, Reade Patrick	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
143	8	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
147	8	Engeler, George	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
153	8	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	[No decision sought.]

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
154	10	Taylor, Joan Eva	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	[No decision sought.]
166	8	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	[No decision sought.]
169	8	Mulherm, M E	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
170	8	Hadlow, C L	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
171	8	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
173	8	Sills, Val Winston	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
174	10	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
176	7	Jones, Graham Laurence	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
177	9	Awhitu, Lucy	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
185	9	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
190	10	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
229	8	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
235	8	Forrest, Logan James	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
239	9	Russell, Keith Ernest	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis. Lack of accessible information renders it difficult to assess the economic impact on the landowner.	No decision sought.
245	10	Legarth, Larson	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
246	9	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
248	1	Williams, Rachael	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	N/A	There are many benefits of considerate planting of vegetation in public areas such as food and shade.	Look to the future of Mangawhai with the benefit of healthy planting such as healthy food and shade.
259	8	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
263	8	Draper, William	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
264	8	Fernandez, Jenni	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
273	8	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
274	8	Poole, Raymond George	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
276	8	Robinson, Perrin	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
278	8	Miller, James Wynard	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
279	8	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
280	8	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
281	8	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
282	5	Kaipara Citizens and Ratepayers Association : Mortensen, Allan :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
284	8	Andrew, L J and N E	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
285	8	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
286	11	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
287	8	MacLean, Angus	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
288	8	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
289	8	Guest, W J and N M	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
293	8	Lulich, Leonard S	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
294	8	Williamson, Robert John	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
295	8	Brown, Stuart WJ	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
296	8	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
612[296]	8	Woodcock, Rodney	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/8.	Disallow submission 296/8.
297	8	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
298	8	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
300	8	Stopher, Allan	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
301	8	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
302	8	Howard, Marie Hazel	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
303	8	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
304	8	Sapiatzer, Peter	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
305	8	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
306	8	Walker, John and Sjannie	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
307	8	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
308	8	Bull, Josph Arthur	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
309	8	Urlich, Lorraine Tereza	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
310	8	Savage, Keith and Velma	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
311	8	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
312	8	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
313	8	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
314	8	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis despite talking to landscape architect and Council members. Variation not fully understood.	No decision sought.
316	8	Hardy, Isabell	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
317	8	House, Stuart Henderson	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
318	8	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
319	8	Otway, Brian Kay	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
320	8	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
321	8	Smith, Kevin and Marilyn	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
322	8	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
323	8	Kemp, Harry	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
324	8	Subritzky, Desmond	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
326	8	Appleton, Gordon George	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
327	8	Bennett, Kawyn	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
328	8	Reed, Douglas	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
329	8	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
3	8	Sellars, Chris	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
330	8	Taurua, Bernice	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
331	8	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
332	8	Ludvigson, Tanya	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
332	9	Ludvigson, Tanya	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	Don't offer anything for rates now.	No more restrictions on land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
333	2	Henry, Richard	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	The submitter states that they would like to protect the environment without the restrictive performance standards.	To protect significant features without stifling progress.
335	8	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
336	8	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
337	8	Ruiterman, A T	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
338	8	Linton, David	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
339	8	Davies, Rhys John	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
341	8	Ballantyne, I K	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
342	8	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
343	8	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
345	8	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
347	8	Gatti, Susan	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
348	8	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
349	8	Williams, Murray	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
350	8	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
351	8	Lees, Tom	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
352	8	Donegan, Julia	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
353	8	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
354	8	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
355	8	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
356	8	Appleton, Lester Winston	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
357	8	Reid, R T S	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
358	8	He, Lisa	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
361	8	Lusty, David James	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
362	8	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
363	8	Vallance, John And Cathy	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
364	8	Warnes, Stuart	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
365	8	Wood, Steven and Susan	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
366	8	McEvoy, R J and A	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
367	8	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
368	8	Robinson, Asa	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
369	8	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
370	8	Brown, Aland and Judith	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
381	8	Ward, Allison Anne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
383	4	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	N/A	The submitter states that 'co-operations should not in any way be excluded from Variation 1 Landscapes and its rules'	No decision sought.
383	11	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	In Part	The submitter states that incentives to farmers to protect bush would be effective.	No decision sought.
388	8	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
389	8	Malam, Anne Marie	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
392	8	Anderson, Audrey	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
399	8	Ward, Chris	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
404	8	Sidwell, Craig	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
414	8	Green, Donna	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
416	8	Blitvic, Dwayne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
418	10	Wills, Edward	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
422	8	Blitvic, Elaine	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
424	8	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
428	8	Hooker, Gary	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
430	9	Fish, Isabel	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
439	8	Anderson, Innes McRae	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
440	8	Blitvic, Ivan	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
443	8	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
469	8	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
476	2	Jennings, Lorraine	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Support	Proposed design for Leslie Street, Mangawhai. Development and infrastructure is out-dated.	Consider developing Leslie Street, Mangawhai per design.
477	8	Davey, Louanne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
483	8	Baines, Martin Hamer	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
491	8	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
502	8	Halse, Robyne	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
504	8	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
506	8	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
510	8	Fish, Terence Henry	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
514	8	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
515	8	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	N/A	The submitter opposes VAL's and OLA's in general, for having different effects on urban and rural areas.	No decision sought.
526	11	Goulding, Timothy	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
553	8	Paterson, CR and CL	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
555	8	Carter, W M	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
70	12	Smith, Edward John	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
8	9	Underwood, Kenneth	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought
604[8]	242	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Support	Supports submission 8/9	Allow submission 8/9

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
96	8	Russell, Ian	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought.
97	9	Hindrup, Ray	Miscellaneous	Unclear submission point	Oppose	KDC has failed in its statutory obligation to ensure that all ratepayers have received all of the relevant information to allow them to make a submission on a fully informed basis.	No decision sought

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	44	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Amendments to assessment criteria for Chapter 10 supported as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
378	45	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Network Utilities	Rules	In Part	Criteria 10.11.2(1)(vii) needs amendment to provide for consistency with 10.11.2(1)(iii).	Insert 'Whether, ' at the start of 10.11.2(1)(vii)
378	46	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Supports new rule 10.11.3, its permitted activity performance standards a) and b) and making activity status discretionary where the standards are not met.	No decision sought.
397	54	Hawley, Catherine and John	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Amendments to assessment criteria for Chapter 10 supported as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
397	55	Hawley, Catherine and John	Network Utilities	Rules	In Part	Criteria 10.11.2(1)(vii) needs amendment to provide for consistency with 10.11.2(1)(iii).	Insert 'Whether, ' at the start of 10.11.2(1)(vii)
397	56	Hawley, Catherine and John	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Supports new rule 10.11.3, its permitted activity performance standards a) and b) and making activity status discretionary where the standards are not met.	No decision sought.
451	44	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Amendments to assessment criteria for Chapter 10 supported as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
451	45	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Network Utilities	Rules	In Part	Criteria 10.11.2(1)(vii) needs amendment to provide for consistency with 10.11.2(1)(iii).	Insert 'Whether, ' at the start of 10.11.2(1)(vii)
451	46	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Supports new rule 10.11.3, its permitted activity performance standards a) and b) and making activity status discretionary where the standards are not met.	No decision sought.
494	6	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Network Utilities	Rules	Support	Supports rule 10.11.3.	No decision sought.
494	7	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Network Utilities	Rules	Oppose	Opposes rules 10.11.14 on as they do not specifically state that the rules do not apply to those areas within an OLA.	Amend the rules following 10.11.3 to follow the same approach as other chapters (e.g. 12.10.4) in specifically stating that they do not apply to land within an OLA.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
110	5	Hogan, Jonathon	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
137	5	Dalbeth, Valerie	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
141	5	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
142	5	Murray, Reade Patrick	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
143	5	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
147	5	Engeler, George	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
153	5	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
154	7	Taylor, Joan Eva	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
166	5	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
169	5	Mulherm, M E	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
170	5	Hadlow, C L	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
171	5	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
173	5	Sills, Val Winston	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
174	7	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
176	5	Jones, Graham Laurence	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
177	6	Awhitu, Lucy	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
185	6	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
190	7	Pirie, James and Stephanie	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
229	5	Bunting, Penelope Ann	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
235	5	Forrest, Logan James	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
239	6	Russell, Keith Ernest	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
245	7	Legarth, Larson	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
246	6	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
259	5	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
263	5	Draper, William	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
264	5	Fernandez, Jenni	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
273	5	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
274	5	Poole, Raymond George	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
276	5	Robinson, Perrin	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
278	5	Miller, James Wynard	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
279	5	Miller, Shirley Dawn	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
280	5	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
281	5	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
282	3	Kaipara Citizens and Ratepayers Association : Mortensen, Allan :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
283	110	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
284	5	Andrew, L J and N E	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
285	5	Lupton, Ian Christopher	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
286	8	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
287	5	MacLean, Angus	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
288	5	Jeffer Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
289	5	Guest, W J and N M	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
293	5	Lulich, Leonard S	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
294	5	Williamson, Robert John	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
295	5	Brown, Stuart WJ	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
296	5	Woodcock, Rodney	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
612[296]	5	Woodcock, Rodney	NRPS	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/5.	Disallow submission 296/5.
297	5	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
298	5	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
300	5	Stopher, Allan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
301	5	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
302	5	Howard, Marie Hazel	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
303	5	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
304	5	Sapiatzer, Peter	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
305	5	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
306	5	Walker, John and Sjannie	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
307	5	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
308	5	Bull, Jospeh Arthur	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
309	5	Ulrich, Lorraine Tereza	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
310	5	Savage, Keith and Velma	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
311	5	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
312	5	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
313	5	Wordsworth, Stanley James	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
314	5	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
316	5	Hardy, Isabell	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
317	5	House, Stuart Henderson	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
318	5	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
319	5	Otway, Brian Kay	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
320	5	Harrison, Donald Joseph	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
321	5	Smith, Kevin and Marilyn	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
322	5	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
323	5	Kemp, Harry	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
324	5	Subritzky, Desmond	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
326	5	Appleton, Gordon George	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
327	5	Bennett, Kawyn	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
328	5	Reed, Douglas	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
329	5	Murphy, Denise-Gae	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
3	5	Sellars, Chris	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
330	5	Taurua, Bernice	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
331	5	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
332	5	Ludvigson, Tanya	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
335	5	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
336	5	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
337	5	Ruiterman, A T	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
338	5	Linton, David	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
339	5	Davies, Rhys John	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
341	5	Ballantyne, I K	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
342	5	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
343	5	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
345	5	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
347	5	Gatti, Susan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
348	5	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
349	5	Williams, Murray	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
350	5	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
351	5	Lees, Tom	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
352	5	Donegan, Julia	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
353	5	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
354	5	Godfrey, Ian Rex	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
355	5	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
356	5	Appleton, Lester Winston	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
357	5	Reid, R T S	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
358	5	He, Lisa	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
361	5	Lusty, David James	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
362	5	Hargreaves, David and Mary	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
363	5	Vallance, John And Cathy	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
364	5	Warnes, Stuart	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
365	5	Wood, Steven and Susan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
366	5	McEvoy, R J and A	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
367	5	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
368	5	Robinson, Asa	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
369	5	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
370	5	Brown, Aland and Judith	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
374	2	Te Runanga O Ngati Whatua : Pivac, Allan :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Variation may presume what is to be included in the NRPS and result in confusion.	Suspend Variation until review of NRPS complete, using that time to consult with affected Ngati Whatua and other landowners.
381	5	Ward, Allison Anne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
387	5	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
388	5	Ross, Angus and Sharon	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
389	5	Malam, Anne Marie	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
392	5	Anderson, Audrey	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
399	5	Ward, Chris	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
404	5	Sidwell, Craig	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
414	5	Green, Donna	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
416	5	Blitvic, Dwayne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
418	7	Wills, Edward	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
422	5	Blitvic, Elaine	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
424	5	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
428	5	Hooker, Gary	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
430	6	Fish, Isabel	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
440	5	Blitvic, Ivan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
443	5	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
449	6	Maurie, Graham Neil Kenneth	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
456	6	Jepson, Craig	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
462	6	Joydon's Pearl st Association : Rowbothman, Mark :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
465	6	Rowbotham, Mark Watson	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
467	6	Dugdale, Kenneth	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
469	5	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
477	5	Davey, Louanne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
491	5	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
502	5	Halse, Robyne	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
503	6	Cullen, Shane Noel	NRPS	None	Oppose	Concerned that due to the Plan preceding the development of the RPS the Plan will need to be reviewed and amended if it is in conflict.	Defer the further submission process until all necessary work, including ground truthing, is completed.
504	5	Dix, Trevor Quintin	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
506	5	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
510	5	Fish, Terence Henry	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
514	5	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
521	3	Ward, Wayne	NRPS	None	Oppose	It has been recommended that the plan should not be made operative until the NRC has completed the public consultation on the Regional Policy Statement.	Withdraw the Plan and renotify as a draft plan or review the plan for the current.
526	8	Goulding, Timothy	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
553	5	Paterson, CR and CL	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
555	5	Carter, W M	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
70	9	Smith, Edward John	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
8	6	Underwood, Kenneth	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
604[8]	239	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	NRPS	None	Support	Supports submission 8/6	Allow submission 8/6
92	7	Bishop, Robert Alan	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
96	5	Russell, Ian	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
97	6	Hindrup, Ray	NRPS	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
439	5	Anderson, Innes McRae	NRPS	VALs in general	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.
538	3	Schick, Gordon (Gus)	NRPS	VALs in general	In Part	VALs should not be included in Variation 1, but held until NRPS is complete.	Exclude VALs from the Variation pending an Environment Court decision on the acceptability of the VAL scheme.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
373	1	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Policy 13 of The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires identification of high natural character areas with objectives, policies and rules.	Identify and insert maps of high natural character areas of the coastal environment. Include objectives, policies and rules on natural character.
608[373]	1	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/1.	Submission 373/1 be disallowed.
373	2	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Policy 15 of the NZCPS requires a landscape survey of the entire coastal environment.	Initiate a district wide review of natural features and landscapes giving effect to Policy 15 of the NZCPS.
608[373]	2	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/2.	Submission 373/2 be disallowed.
373	3	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Policy 17 of the NZCPS requires an assessment and management of historic heritage in a Historic Landscapes context is undertaken.	Include a method that identifies that future work is required to identify and manage Historic Landscapes.
374	1	Te Runanga O Ngati Whatua : Pivac, Allan :	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Insufficient consistency between Policy 15 NZCPS and Variation.	Suspend Variation until review of NRPS complete, using that time to consult with affected Ngati Whatua and other landowners.
397	15	Hawley, Catherine and John	NZCPS 2010	None	In Part	An additional issue is needed to reflect the NZCPS 2010.	Insert additional issue with wording suggested within the submission.
452	4	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	NZCPS 2010	None	N/A	The Variation should give effect to the NZCPS 2010.	Amend Chapter 18 to give effect to NZCPS 2010.
602[452]	31	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	NZCPS 2010	None	Support	Supports submission 452/4	Allow submission 452/4
483	5	Baines, Martin Hamer	NZCPS 2010	None	Oppose	Does not support the progression or making the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS as this will result in review and rework of the Plan once the new RPS is introduced.	Do not progress or make the Proposed Plan operative until the NRC have completed the consultation process on the new RPS.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
498	1	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	NZCPS 2010	None	N/A	The plan should address outstanding natural features as section 6 matters and to improve consistency with the Regional Policy Statement and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010.	Include outstanding natural features (ONF) on Map Series one and relevant parts of the Plan to be consistent with Policy 14 of the NZCPS. At a minimum include sites identified in the Geopreservation Society Inventory2.
589[498]	21	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	NZCPS 2010	None	Support	Supports submission 498/1.	Accept submission 498/1.
603[498]	1	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	NZCPS 2010	None	Support	Supports submission 498/1.	Submission 498/1 be allowed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	19	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	General	In Part	Objective is needed to reflect the intention of s7 of the RMA and from which policies 18.7.2 a) to e) can follow.	Add additional objective with wording suggested within the submission, specifically for VALs.
452	6	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Objective	General	N/A	Landscape values exist outside identified OLAs and VALs. These are likely to be at a site or area specific scale but deserve recognition and appropriate management.	Add a new objective to 18.6. Wording provided by submitter.
606[452]	10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Objective	General	Oppose	Oppose submission 452/6.	Submission 452/6 be disallowed.
602[452]	20	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Objective	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 452/6	Disallow submission 452/6
458	4	Anderson, John	Objective	General	Support	The submitter supports positive incentives in the Landscape Objectives.	The submitter seeks encouragement such as rates and fees rebates.
464	4	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Objective	General	In Part	Objectives of Chapter 18 do not recognise farming as a major part of the district.	Insert a new objective in Chapter 18 to recognise the need to protect OLAs and VALs whilst not impacting on everyday farming.
464	8	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Objective	General	In Part	Landscape objectives need to be consistent with other chapters of the Proposed District Plan.	Insert four additional objectives as suggested within the submission to 1. Support property owners who protect Landscape Areas. 2. Identify and protect VAL's of the district, where landowners agree. 3. Recognise and support landowners who protect Landscape Areas by providing increased development opportunities. 4. Provide information on what makes a VAL area worthy of identification and protection.
517	5	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Objective	General	Support	The submitter supports Objectives 18.6.1 and 18.6.2.	The submitter seeks that Objectives 18.6.1 and 18.6.2 are retained.
518	9	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	General	Oppose	The submitter does not support Objectives 18.6.1 - 18.6.4 in relation to OLA 15, do not support economic or social well-being.	No decision specified.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
538	1	Schick, Gordon (Gus)	Objective	General	Support	Objectives of Variation 1 are well researched and laudable.	Not stated.
459	3	Bull, John R L	Objective	None	Support	There are no encouraging incentives in the Plan.	Provide practical encouraging incentives such as rates and fee rebates.
25	9	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	Support	Supports the objective and in particular the inclusion of the word 'inappropriate'.	Retain objective 18.6.1 as drafted.
258	3	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of the word 'inappropriate' in Section 18.6.1 or Variation 1.	The submitter seeks that a the wording of the objectives should be rational with a definable standard.
601[258]	4	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	Oppose	Opposes submission 258/3	Disallow submission 258/3
283	10	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	Oppose	Permitted activity controls suggest a minor change in an OLA is inappropriate. This compromises on-going reasonable use.	Clarify the term "inappropriate" in the context of Variation 1.
373	7	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	More appropriate wording for dealing with adverse effects from built structures is sought. The location and appearance are the key constraints of built structures in OLAs.	Add the words "location and appearance of" between "including the" and "built structures".
378	16	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	Objective 18.6.1 should stand alone as per s6(b) of the RMA with a separate objective to cover the activities.	Amend by adding an additional objective as per the wording included by the submitter to manage activities in OLA's and VAL's.
397	16	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	Objective 18.6.1 should stand alone (as per s6(b) of the RMA) with the activities referred to in objective 18.6.1 (as notified) to be contained in a separate objective.	Amend by adding an additional objective as per the wording included by the submitter to manage activities in OLAs and VALs.
601[397]	3	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	Oppose	Opposes submission 397/16	Disallow submission 397/16
451	16	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	Objective 18.6.1 should stand alone as per s6(b) of the RMA with a separate objective to cover the activities.	Amend by adding an additional objective as per the wording included by the submitter to manage activities in OLA's and VAL's.
452	12	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	N/A	Amend Objective 18.6.1 by adding additional words.	Amend Objective 18.6.1 by adding additional words. Wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
453	7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Objective 18.6.1.	The submitter states that Objective 18.6.1 should be amended to recognise earthworks and vegetation clearance, while enabling activities that are inappropriate to occur.
464	9	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	Objective 18.6.1 needs to be simplified.	Delete all wording beyond 'development'.
486	12	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Objective	Objective 18.6.1	In Part	Submitter notes that it is improper to pre-determine activities that are inappropriate use and development in this objective.	Objective 18.6.1 should be amended by deleting listed activities. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
25	10	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	The use of brackets in the objective suggests that remedying or mitigating are of a lower value and do not have the same status as avoiding.	Remove the brackets within the Objective.
283	11	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	Oppose	VAL provisions do not make sense / are impractical.	Remove reference to Visual Amenity Landscapes from Variation 1.
373	8	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	A more appropriate description of the landscape objectives could be provided.	Insert words "as far as practicable" after "remedies or mitigates such effects". Replace the phrase "avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects" with "does not compromise".
378	17	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	Objective 18.6.2 should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	17	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	Objective 18.6.2 should be amended.	Amend objective 18.6.2 as suggested within the submission.
451	17	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	Objective 18.6.2 should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
453	8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	The submitter supports in part Objective 18.6.2.	The submitter seeks that Objective 18.6.2 is amended to delete VAL's (wording provided in submission).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
463	7	Kaipara District Council :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	The submitter states that Objective 18.6.2 is repetitive.	The submitter seeks that Objective 18.6.2 is reworded to avoid repetition of the term 'avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects'.
601[463]	5	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	Support	Supports submission 463/7	Allow submission 463/7
589[463]	68	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	Support	Supports submission 463/7.	Accept submission 463/7.
464	10	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	Objective 18.6.2 should separate OLAs and VALs.	Delete wording after '...such effects'.
486	13	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	The word 'significant' should be included in Objective 18.6.2 so that it is less restrictive and does not require all adverse effects to be avoided.	Objective 18.6.2 should be amended to include word 'significant' and other changes provided by submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
575[486]	11	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 486/13.	Submission 486/13 be disallowed.
576[486]	11	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Objective	Objective 18.6.2	In Part	Opposes submission 486/13 in part	Disallow submission 486/13 in part
283	12	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	Oppose	The social and economic wellbeing of landowners has been disregarded. There is no incentive for landowners to manage or protect OLAs.	Exclude private property from OLAs
373	9	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	Some landscapes require to be enhanced in order to be protected.	Add the words "and enhancement" after "voluntary protection".
378	18	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	Objective 18.6.3 should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter recognising OLAs and VALs.
397	18	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	Objective 18.6.3 should be amended.	Amend objective 18.6.3 as suggested within the submission recognising OLAs and VALs.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	18	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	Objective 18.6.3 should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter recognising OLA's and VAL's.
453	9	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	The submitter supports in part Objective 18.6.3.	The submitter seeks that Objective 18.6.3 is amended to add 'by utilising regulatory incentives and non-regulatory methods.'
464	11	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Objective	Objective 18.6.3	In Part	Objective 18.6.3 should separate OLAs and VALs.	Insert 'and enhance' after 'protection'.
283	13	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Objective	Objective 18.6.4	Oppose	The objective is not understood.	Clarify the meaning / justification of Objective 18.6.4
378	19	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Objective	Objective 18.6.4	In Part	Objective 18.6.4 to remain as proposed, but that an additional objective be included to reflect the intentions of s7 of the RMA.	Include an additional objective as per the wording included by the submitter, specifically for VALs.
397	83	Hawley, Catherine and John	Objective	Objective 18.6.4	Support	Supports objective 18.6.4.	No change.
451	19	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Objective	Objective 18.6.4	In Part	Objective 18.6.4 to remain as proposed, but that an additional objective be included to reflect the intentions of s7 of the RMA.	Include an additional objective as per the wording included by the submitter, specifically for VAL's.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	30	Hawley, Catherine and John	Other Methods	General	Support	Additional outcomes should be included to reflect the objectives.	Add 2 additional outcomes with wording suggested within the submission.
407	9	Nickolson, Dave	Other Methods	General	Oppose	Does not support Other Methods 18.8.2 if this means rates will increase.	No decision sought.
450	9	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Other Methods	General	Oppose	Does not support Other Methods 18.8.2 if this means rates will increase.	No decision sought.
452	9	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Other Methods	General	N/A	The Council should monitor and review the content of Chapter 18 and other relevant District Plan provisions.	To include additional wording in section 18.8.2 Other Methods. Wording provided by submitter.
492	9	Grierson, Monique	Other Methods	General	Oppose	Does not support Other Methods 18.8.2 if this means rates will increase.	No decision sought.
451	30	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Other Methods	Method 18.8.2	In Part	Method 18.8.2 is generally supported, but an additional incentive method is proposed, but rates relief for covenanted areas.	Include an additional incentive method as per wording provided by submitter.
234	2	Robinson, Harold and Raewyn	Other Methods	Method 18.8.2	Support	Support the pest control programme.	Develop pest control for Maungaroto Rock Reserve.
378	30	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Other Methods	Method 18.8.2	In Part	Method 18.8.2 is generally supported, but an additional incentive method is proposed, for rates relief for covenanted areas.	Include an additional incentive method as per wording provided by submitter.
397	28	Hawley, Catherine and John	Other Methods	Other Method 18.8.2	Support	A incentive method relating to rates relief should be added to 18.8.2.	Add additional method to 18.8.2 as suggested within the submission for rates relief.
10	3	Whangarei District Council : McGrath, Melissa :	Other Methods	Other Method 18.8.2	Support	Supports Other Method 18.8.2 (bullet point 7) and notes the following: that there is an issue of consistent identification of outstanding landscapes cross boundaries between Kaipara District and Whangarei District; and that there is a risk that the method specified within the new Northland Regional Policy Statement to identify outstanding natural features and landscapes may differ from that used by Kaipara District Council.	Seeks to retain Other Method 18.8.2 (bullet point 7).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	40	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Outcome	General	Oppose	Outcomes are numbered incorrectly.	Amend Outcome numbers.
378	32	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Outcome	General	N/A	18.9 Outcomes should have two additional points included to better reflect the objectives as proposed by submitter.	Include two additional points after 18.9.2. Wording is provided in the submission.
451	32	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Outcome	General	N/A	18.9 Outcomes should have two additional points included to better reflect the objectives as proposed by submitter.	Include two additional points after 18.9.2. Wording is provided in the submission.
452	8	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Outcome	General	N/A	Landscape values exist outside identified OLAs and VALs. These are likely to be at a site or area specific scale but deserve recognition and appropriate management.	Include additional wording to section 18.9 Outcomes. Wording provided by submitter.
606[452]	12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Outcome	General	Oppose	Oppose submission 452/8.	Submission 452/8 be disallowed.
464	17	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Outcome	General	In Part	Outcomes 18.9 need to recognise the contribution of landowners.	Insert two additional outcomes as suggested in the submission and include any others to provide for consistency.
25	22	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.1	Support	Supports Outcome and the inclusion of 'inappropriate'.	Retain outcome.
283	41	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	Oppose	Variation 1 will not achieve this outcome. Insufficient evidence has been provided as to why it is necessary to include VALs in Chapter 18.	Remove all references to VALS from Variation 1.
378	31	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	In Part	Outcome 18.9.2 should be amended to reflect the objectives.	Amend with wording provided by the submitter.
397	29	Hawley, Catherine and John	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	Support	Outcome 18.9.2 should be amended.	Amend outcome 18.9.2 as suggested within the submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	31	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	In Part	Outcome 18.9.2 should be amended to reflect the objectives.	Amend with wording provided by the submitter.
486	18	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	N/A	Outcome 19.1.2 should be amended to be consistent with Objective 18.6.2.	Outcome 19.1.2 should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter so that significant adverse effects on VALs are avoided, remedied and mitigated. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
575[486]	14	Hawley, Catherine and John	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 486/18.	Submission 486/18 be disallowed.
576[486]	14	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Outcome	Outcome 19.1.2	In Part	Opposes submission 486/18 in part	Disallow submission 486/18 in part

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
452	2	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Part 2 Matters	None	N/A	Variation is in partial response to the Council's obligations under the RMA.	No decision sought
351	9	Lees, Tom	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	Oppose	Council are not doing enough for economic growth.	No decision sought.
499	2	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	In Part	The submitter states that Chapter 18 should be amended.	The submitter states that specific provisions should be included in Chapter 18 that promote the sustainable management of OLA's and VAL's while providing for the appropriate use and development of natural and physical resources of the district including public works.
575[499]	7	Hawley, Catherine and John	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/2.	Submission 499/2 be disallowed.
601[499]	11	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	Support	Supports submission 499/2	Allow submission 499/2
576[499]	7	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	In Part	Opposes submission 499/2 in part	Disallow submission 499/2 in part
598[499]	2	Stuart, Helen	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/2.	Disallow submission 499/2.
515	11	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Part 2 Matters	Section 5	N/A	The submitter states that Maori cultural sites be included in Chapter 18 of the proposed plan.	The submitter seeks that the provisions of the new NZ Coastal Policy Statement are incorporated into Chapter 18 of the proposed plan.
25	1	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Support	Generally supports the approach and content of the Variation in protecting OLA's and maintaining and enhancing VALs which is consistent with Part II of the RMA.	No decision sought.
393	2	Hita, Ben	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Oppose	The Variation deals with Tupuna Whenua and should be dealt with in accordance with Tikanga Maori.	Not stated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
454	1	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	In Part	The submitter is concerned with the omission of Maori cultural values in Variation 1.	The submitter seeks that features of significance to TUOH and Te Roroa that are not already included be included.
592[454]	1	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Support	Supports submission 454/1	Allow submission 454/1
454	2	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	In Part	The submitter is concerned over how and whether the landscape chapter will protect landscapes of cultural value to TUOH and Te Roroa	The submitter seeks that best practice guidelines are developed in association with Tangata Whenua that address Maori cultural values within Kaipara landscapes.
592[454]	2	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Support	Supports submission 454/2	Allow submission 454/2
454	3	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	In Part	The submitter is concerned with whether the sustainable use and development of Maori land will be affected.	The submitter seeks specific plan provision that recognise the nature of land returned through Settlement in terms of TUOH and To Roroa's development aspirations.
592[454]	3	Environs Holdings Limited : Ranger, Alyssce :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Support	Supports submission 454/3	Allow submission 454/3
459	1	Bull, John R L	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	Oppose	Intent of the RMA was to protect NZ outstanding landscapes and not average New Zealand views.	Remove VALs from the variation.
486	4	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Part 2 Matters	Section 6	N/A	Section 6 of the RMA notes that outstanding landscapes must also be 'natural' to warrant protection as a matter of national importance. The Variation's wording, 'Outstanding Landscape Area' does not include the term 'natural'.	That the word 'natural' be inserted between every reference to 'outstanding' and 'landscape' and the introduction be amended to provide clarity that 'naturalness' occurs on a continuum, but at the least means largely devoid of built structures and other human influences. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
438	6	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Part 2 Matters	Section 8	N/A	The submitter states that under the RMA, the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi need to be taken into account	No decision sought.
589[438]	18	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Part 2 Matters	Section 8	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
491	10	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Part 2 Matters	Section 8	Oppose	The District Plan references the special relationship between Maori and their whenua tuku iho and the need for autonomy to manage and develop their lands as they deem appropriate. This is in conflict with the imposition of rules and other mechanisms in the management of OLAs and VALs and a means to prevent iwi from exercising rangatiratanga.	Exclude OLAs from private property and make consequential amendments to the planning maps as necessary.
514	9	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Part 2 Matters	Section 8	N/A	Continuous relationship with land prior to imposition of Government. This Variation is not within the relationship prescribed by the Treaty of Waitangi and is insulting.	Not stated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
1	2	Worsfold, Heath	Policy	General	In Part	Supports in part section 18.7 – Landscape policies.	Introduce Design Guidelines within Chapter 18 or as an Appendix to ensure a consistent approach is taken regarding earthworks and construction in these areas.
452	7	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Policy	General	N/A	Landscape values exist outside identified OLAs and VALs. These are likely to be at a site or area specific scale but deserve recognition and appropriate management.	Add a new policy to 18.7. Wording provided by submitter.
601[452]	6	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 452/7	Disallow submission 452/7
602[452]	22	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 452/7	Disallow submission 452/7
606[452]	11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	General	Oppose	Oppose submission 452/7.	Submission 452/7 be disallowed.
458	5	Anderson, John	Policy	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Landscape Policy text: 'Values to be protected and enhanced'.	The submitter seeks that the policy text be amended to: 'Values to be protected'.
458	6	Anderson, John	Policy	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the policy text: 'Avoid changing landscape formations'.	The submitter seeks that the policy text be worded as: 'Changes to landscape formations to be in sympathy with original formations'.
458	7	Anderson, John	Policy	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the policy text: 'Mitigation by covenant and/or financial contribution'.	The submitter seeks that the policy text be reworded to read: 'Mitigation should be related to the development to [sic] Kaipara's economy'.
458	10	Anderson, John	Policy	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes restrictions being imposed on those who have fenced off/protected bush.	The submitter seeks that incentives be given to those who have fenced off/protected bush.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
517	3	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Policy	General	In Part	The submitter supports Variation 1, with suggested amendments to give effect to the National Environment Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009.	The submitter seeks that the following new policy is included in Variation 1: 'To enable the continuation of existing land use activities within Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes, while protecting outstanding landscapes from the adverse effects of inappropriate land use change and new development.'
517	4	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Policy	General	In Part	The submitter supports Variation 1 - Landscapes with suggested amendments.	The submitter seeks that a new policy is inserted into Variation 1 - Landscapes to give effect to the National Environment Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009: 'New electricity transmission infrastructure should only traverse Outstanding Landscape Areas and Visual Amenity Landscapes where the infrastructure is subject to a significant functional constraint, or where there is no feasible practicable alternative route and/or when significant adverse effects are outweighed by the overall benefits of the proposal.'
602[517]	21	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	General	In Part	Supports submission 517/4 in part	Allow submission 517/4 in part
518	10	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	General	Oppose	The submitter does not support Policies 18.7.1, 18.7.3, 18.7.4 and 18.7.5 in relation to OLA 15.	No decision specified.
489	1	Hayes, Michael Walter	Policy	Policy 18.5.2	Oppose	Protection of OLAs and land use restrictions are contradictory - owners want to protect these landscapes also.	Physically view the landscapes to be protected. Overlays should be deleted from some of these landscapes.
489	2	Hayes, Michael Walter	Policy	Policy 18.5.2	Oppose	Protected landscapes will overly restrict land use with consent requirements.	Physically view the landscapes to be protected. Overlays should be deleted from some of these landscapes.
500	4	Legarth, Olivia	Policy	Policy 18.5.2	Oppose	Landscapes with farmland and the economic wellbeing of farmers not considered in Policy 18.5.2.	Amend commentary of Policy 18.5.2 to acknowledge classification of farmland as an OLA or VAL reduces the value of land and does not provide for the economic wellbeing of farmers.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
489	5	Hayes, Michael Walter	Policy	Policy 18.6.1	Oppose	Council decisions on appropriateness of subdivision and development, like consent decisions, will rarely be based on site visits.	Physically view the landscapes to be protected. 18.6.1 be worded: To protect... from inappropriate... after onsite consultation with the landowner and Council staff (the technician/surveyors).
373	23	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7	In Part	The submitter states that an additional policy is needed in 18.7.	The submitter seeks that an additional policy is included in 18.7 to allow assessment of the visibility of OLAs when viewed from public places.
601[373]	7	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/23	Disallow submission 373/23
606[373]	4	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/23.	Submission 373/23 be disallowed.
602[373]	23	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/23	Disallow submission 373/23
373	24	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7	In Part	The submitter supports 18.7 - Further Policies in part.	The submitter seeks that an additional policy is included in 18.7 - Further Policies to protect the indigenous vegetation in OLAs and VALs.
601[373]	8	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/24	Disallow submission 373/24
606[373]	5	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Oppose submission 373/24.	Submission 373/24 be disallowed.
602[373]	24	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/24	Disallow submission 373/24

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
373	25	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7	In Part	The submitter supports in part Section 18.7 - Further Policies.	The submitter seeks that an additional policy is included in Section 18.7, as follows: That landscape values be protected by encouraging development that takes into 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 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 values; 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.
601[373]	9	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/25	Disallow submission 373/25
606[373]	6	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/25.	Submission 373/25 be disallowed.
373	26	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7	In Part	The submitter supports in part Section 18.7 - Further Policies.	The submitter seeks that an additional policy is inserted in Section 18.7 to protect vegetation (as worded in submission).
606[373]	7	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Oppose submission 373/26.	Submission 373/26 be disallowed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
602[373]	25	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/26	Disallow submission 373/26
373	27	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7	In Part	The submitter supports in part Section 18.7 - Further Policies.	The submitter seeks that an additional policy is inserted into Section 18.7 to read: 'To ensure that adverse visual effects of earthworks scarps on outstanding natural features and landscapes are avoided and that the adverse visual effects on notable landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated as far as practicable, by encouraging re-vegetation of earthworks scarps'.
601[373]	10	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/27	Disallow submission 373/27
601[373]	11	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Supports submission 499/2	Allow submission 499/2
606[373]	8	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Oppose submission 373/27.	Submission 373/27 be disallowed.
602[373]	26	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/27	Disallow submission 373/27
25	11	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Support	Policy 18.7.1 c) is supported through the inclusion of the term 'inappropriate'.	Support Policy 18.7.1 c).
25	12	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Clause f) is not consistent within the policy and explanation.	Amend clause f) by inserting 'inappropriate' after 'Avoiding'.
25	13	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The fourth paragraph of the explanation needs amending to recognise that not all development should be avoided and in some instances effects can be avoided or remedied.	Amend the fourth paragraph of the explanation as suggested by the submitter recognising 'inappropriate' and the ability to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate effects'.
25	14	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The use of the word 'compromise' in clause f) is unclear.	Clarify what would 'compromise' OLA values.
25	15	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Support	The last paragraph of the explanation is supported as it recognises mitigation measures including covenants.	Support the last paragraph of the explanation.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	14	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Policy 18.7.1(a) is not appropriate for determining whether a resource consent application is consistent with the Plan.	Remove clause (a) of Policy 18.7.1.
283	15	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	No compensation or financial incentive has been offered to cover the cost of protecting OLAs.	Remove clause (b) of Policy 18.7.1, or include financial incentives for developers.
283	16	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	The intention of clause (d) is not clear.	Clarify the meaning / interpretation of clause (d) of Policy 18.7.1.
283	17	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	The intention of clause (e) is not clear.	Clarify the meaning / interpretation of clause (e) of Policy 18.7.1.
283	18	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	OLA values are not defined.	Clarify the meaning / interpretation of clause (f) of Policy 18.7.1.
283	19	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Paragraph three of the explanation and clause (a) of Policy 18.7.1 are unnecessary. It is unreasonable to apply restrictions prior to defining the areas.	Remove paragraph three of the explanation and clause (a) from Policy 18.7.1
283	20	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Punctuation is required in the third sentence of paragraph four of the explanation. This statement raises concerns relating to reasonable use of private property.	Amend Policy 18.7.1 explanation to correct punctuation and exclude private property from OLAs.
283	21	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	The meaning of paragraph six of the explanation is not clear, specifically reference to views, views shafts and landscape values which are not defined in the Plan.	Clarify/ amend Plan.
283	22	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	The meaning /interpretation of paragraph seven of the explanation, which refers to activities which pose the greatest threat, is not clear.	Clarify/ amend Plan.
283	23	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Clarify how financial contributions could be calculated/ offered to protect and enhance landscape values.	Clarify/ remove reference to financial contributions payable by the applicant.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	20	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 paragraphs (a) and (b) should have changes to the wording included.	Amend with wording included in submission.
378	21	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Submitter suggests two additional points be included in Policy 18.7.1 between points (c) and (d).	Include two additional points, as per wording provided by submitter in relation to character and view protection.
378	22	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The wording of Policy 18.7.1 paragraph (d) should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	23	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	N/A	An additional point should be added to Policy 18.7.1 after point (f).	Include an additional point in Policy 18.7.1 for cumulative effects.
378	24	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 Explanation should be amended to ensure that the purpose of the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report and Appendices A, B and C are clear, accurate, and not confusing or inconsistent.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	20	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 a), b) and d) need minor amendment.	Amend policy 18.7.1 a), b) and d) with wording suggested within the submission.
397	21	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Additional policies are required in Policy 18.7.1.	Add an additional 3 policies within policy 18.7.1, with wording suggested within the submission to: 1. Protect ridgelines; 2. Retain character of 'uninhabited'; 3. Take into account cumulative effects.
602[397]	27	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Opposes submission 397/21 in part	Disallow submission 397/21 in part
397	22	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The explanation of policy 18.7.1 is unclear and inaccurately explained, confusing or inconsistent.	Amend the explanation of policy 18.7.1 through additions and deletions as suggested within the submission.
405	4	Shearer, Craig	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Support	The submitter supports Policy 18.7.1.f	The submitter requests that the final two words 'the coast' of Policy 18.7.1.f are retained.
451	20	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 paragraphs (a) and (b) should have changes to the wording included.	Amend with wording included in submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	21	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Submitter suggests two additional points be included in Policy 18.7.1 between points (c) and (d).	Include two additional points, as per wording provided by submitter in relation to character and view protection.
451	22	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The wording of Policy 18.7.1 paragraph (d) should be amended.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
451	23	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	N/A	An additional point should be added to Policy 18.7.1 after point (f).	Include an additional point in Policy 18.7.1 for cumulative effects.
451	24	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 Explanation should be amended to ensure that the purpose of the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report and Appendices A, B and C are clear, accurate, and not confusing or inconsistent.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
452	13	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	N/A	Amend the wording of Policy 18.7.1.	Amend the wording of Policy 18.7.1 to include identification of OLA's.
453	10	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 18.7.1.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.1 is amended to recognise Appendix for criteria and to recognise the balance of balance of protection and use of items C - F and to recognise methods for protection.
603[453]	3	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Opposes submission 453/10.	Submission 453/10 be disallowed.
459	4	Bull, John R L	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Policy 18.7.1 is too harsh.	Delete the word 'enhanced' from Policy 18.7.1.
459	5	Bull, John R L	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Policy 18.7.1 is too harsh.	Changes to landscape formations should be in sympathy with original formations.
459	6	Bull, John R L	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Policy 18.7.1 is too harsh.	Mitigation should be related to the development to Kaipara's economy.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
464	12	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	There is no reference to where key viewpoints, views and view shafts are and no reference to Appendix 18A in Policy 18.7.1.	Remove reference to key viewpoints, views and view shafts and include reference to Appendix 18A.
486	14	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Policy 18.7.1 and the accompanying Explanation should be amended so that it gives effect to Objectives 18.6.1 and 18.6.2. It is considered improper to pre-determine activities that are inappropriate use and development.	Policy 18.7.1 should be amended with the wording provided by the submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed. Particularly 18.7.1(c) and replace words "avoiding inappropriate subdivision" with text provided by submitter.
575[486]	12	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Oppose	Opposes submission 486/14.	Submission 486/14 be disallowed.
576[486]	12	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	In Part	Opposes submission 486/14 in part	Disallow submission 486/14 in part
498	10	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	N/A	Policy 18.7.1 implies the Plan will manage land use adjacent to identified OLA. It should be explicit where this control is applied.	Amend Policy 18.7.1(f) with the wording provided, to be clear areas within OLA being managed.
606[498]	16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Support	Supports submission 498/10.	Submission 498/10 be allowed.
498	14	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	N/A	Policy 18.7.1 suggests the use of covenants, but these are entirely voluntary.	Include Consent Notices under Section 221 of the RMA in the explanation to Policy 18.7.1.
517	6	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Policy	Policy 18.7.1	Support	The submitter supports Policies 18.7.1(a) and (b).	The submitter seeks that Policies 18.7.1(a) and (b) are retained.
25	16	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Clause b) should include the term 'mitigation' as well as 'remediation' as the two concepts are different and either would be appropriate in different circumstances.	Amend clause b) wording as suggested by the submitter to provide for mitigation and remediation.
25	17	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Clause c) should be amended to include 'inappropriate' and 'adverse' to recognise that not all effects need to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Amend clause c) wording as suggested by the submitter in their submission, to include the concept of 'inappropriate' activities.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
25	18	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	The fifth paragraph of the explanation is not supported as the issue of protecting views is not outlined in the policy, the explanation is uncertain and open to interpretation in that important views, view shafts and viewpoints are not defined.	Delete paragraph 5 of the explanation.
283	24	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Insufficient evidence has been provided as to why it is necessary to include VALs in Chapter 18.	Remove all references to VALs from Variation 1.
283	25	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Clarify how a resource consent application can be consistent with clause (a), as the values are not defined.	Clarify/ amend Policy 18.7.2(a)
283	26	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Implementation of this policy and rules will be subjective.	Not stated.
283	27	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	The meaning /interpretation of the term naturalistic planting in clause (e) is not clear.	Clarify the term naturalistic planting and amend the Plan accordingly.
283	28	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	The meaning of the second paragraph of the explanation is not clear and does not directly relate to the policy.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly.
283	29	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	The explanation refers to terminology not consistent with the Objectives and Policies of Chapter 18.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly to use consistent terminology.
283	30	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Additional information and costs associated with applicants making an assessment under Appendix 18C.	Remove all references to VALs from Variation 1.
283	31	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Paragraph 4 refers to the protection of view shafts and values	Clarify how protection of view shafts and values is to be achieved.
283	32	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Paragraph 6 of the explanation does not recognise the need to balance landscapes with other considerations such as engineering.	Include a statement that considerations are to be balanced with Engineering requirements and the like.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	33	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Clarify the meaning of paragraph 7 of the explanation.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly.
373	10	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	The wording of 18.7.2(b) is not directive.	Replace the opening words "Providing for" in 18.7.2(b) with "Ensuring".
373	11	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2(e) should recognise that in some instances existing plantings may be inappropriate with the landscape.	Amend Policy 18.7.2(e) to read: "Encouraging planting patterns to reflect important patterns in the local landscape".
373	12	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	A more appropriate description of landscape policy should be provided.	Delete the last words "and lots sizes should be varied." from 18.7.2 fourth paragraph of the explanation and replace with "...to follow the landform and lot sizes should be varied accordingly."
378	25	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 (a) - (e) is generally supported with minor amendments to ensure clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
378	26	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 Explanation should be amended to ensure that the purpose of the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report and Appendices A, B and C are clear and accurately explained.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	23	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Minor amendments are needed to policy 18.7.2 for clarification.	Amend policy 18.7.2 b), c) and e) as suggested within the submission.
397	24	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	The explanation of policy 18.7.2 is unclear and inaccurately explained, confusing or inconsistent.	Amend policy 18.7.2 explanation with additions and deletions of text as suggested within the submission.
451	25	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 (a) - (e) is generally supported with minor amendments to ensure clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	26	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 Explanation should be amended to ensure that the purpose of the Kaipara District Landscape Technical Report and Appendices A, B and C are clear and accurately explained.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
453	11	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 18.7.2.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.2 is deleted from Variation 1 - Landscapes.
464	13	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 is repetitive and different to the draft 7 September 2010 chapter Council adopted. There is no reference to Appendix 18A.	Remove c) and e) as these are covered in b) and d). Delete paragraph 5 and 6. Include reference to Appendix 18A and remove words 'Appendix G'.
486	15	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Policy 18.7.2 and the accompanying Explanation should be amended so that it gives effect to Objective 18.6.2. It is considered improper to pre-determine activities that are inappropriate use and development.	Policy 18.7.2 should be amended to "avoid, remedy or mitigate" effects rather than maintain and enhance values. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
575[486]	13	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 486/15.	Submission 486/15 be disallowed.
576[486]	13	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Opposes submission 486/15 in part	Disallow submission 486/15 in part
499	4	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Where development needs to occur in these areas and the landscape values cannot be maintained it needs to allow for developments which will have significant positive effects for the wider public provided that any significant adverse effects have been avoided, remedied and mitigated as far as practicable.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.2(b) is amended to reflect submission or deleted (wording provided by submitter). Or words to that effect, or this policy be deleted in its entirety.
575[499]	8	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/4.	Submission 499/4 be disallowed.
598[499]	4	Stuart, Helen	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/4.	Disallow submission 499/4.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
576[499]	8	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Opposes submission 499/4 in part	Disallow submission 499/4 in part
560[499]	5	Stuart, Ian William	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/4.	Disallow submission 499/4.
499	5	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	The submitter states that in some cases it is not always practicable for a number of reasons (technical, economic or legal) to avoid, remedy or mitigate all effects of an activity. In addition this should be limited to avoiding, remedying or mitigating significant adverse effects.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.2(c) be amended to as per submission to provide for the issue raised or this policy be deleted in its entirety.
575[499]	9	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/5.	Submission 499/5 be disallowed.
576[499]	9	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Opposes submission 499/5 in part	Disallow submission 499/5 in part
598[499]	5	Stuart, Helen	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/5.	Disallow submission 499/5.
560[499]	6	Stuart, Ian William	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/5.	Disallow submission 499/5.
499	6	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	The submitter supports Policy 18.7.2(d) in principle with suggested amendments.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.2(d) is amended to reflect the submission (wording provided by submitter) or words to that effect or delete policy.
575[499]	10	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/6.	Submission 499/6 be disallowed.
576[499]	10	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	In Part	Opposes submission 499/6 in part	Disallow submission 499/6 in part
598[499]	6	Stuart, Helen	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/6.	Disallow submission 499/6.
560[499]	12	Stuart, Ian William	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/6.	Disallow submission 499/6.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
500	1	Legarth, Olivia	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Oppose	OLA and VAL notations compromise private property rights without compensation. Capital value of land is reduced. The difficulty in quantifying compensation is acknowledged.	Amend 18.8.2 to compensate landowners for financial loss.
517	10	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Policy	Policy 18.7.2	Support	The submitter supports Policy 18.7.2.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.2 is retained.
10	2	Whangarei District Council : McGrath, Melissa :	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Support	Supports policy 18.7.3 and notes the following: that there is an issue of consistent identification of outstanding landscapes cross boundaries between Kaipara District and Whangarei District; and that there is a risk that the method specified within the new Northland Regional Policy Statement to identify outstanding natural features and landscapes may differ from that used by Kaipara District Council.	Retain policy 18.7.3.
283	34	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Oppose	Clarify the appropriateness and practical application of Policy 18.7.3.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly.
373	13	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Oppose	The Policy does not represent a Resource Management issue which can be applied when assessing a Resource Consent.	Delete Policy 18.7.3.
407	7	Nickolson, Dave	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Oppose	Policy 18.7.3 states that there needs to be a consistent approach between local authorities in the identification, protection and maintenance of OLAs. It is unclear why and why included as a landowner have no ability to control areas.	Delete Policy 18.7.3.
450	7	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Oppose	Policy 18.7.3 states that there needs to be a consistent approach between local authorities in the identification, protection and maintenance of OLAs. It is unclear why and why included as a landowner have no ability to control areas.	Delete Policy 18.7.3.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
492	7	Grierson, Monique	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Oppose	Policy 18.7.3 states that there needs to be a consistent approach between local authorities in the identification, protection and maintenance of OLAs. It is unclear why and why included as a landowner have no ability to control areas.	Delete Policy 18.7.3.
498	17	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Policy	Policy 18.7.3	Support	Support Policy 18.7.3 (with inclusion of ONF) promoting a collaborative approach.	No decision sought.
25	19	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	Inconsistent use of terminology as 'utilities' is not defined in the variation. Suggest this should say 'network utilities'.	Clarify if the policy relates to 'network utilities' as opposed to 'utilities'.
25	20	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	Policy explanation needs amendment to provide for consistent terminology between the policy and explanation.	Replace 'possible' with 'practicable' in the explanation.
25	27	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Support	Support the Policy, particularly the word 'practicable'	Retain as drafted.
373	14	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	The Policy should recognise that existing patterns may not always be appropriate and landscape features views and elements are an additional consideration apart from landscape patterns.	Delete the word "existing" before "patterns" in Policy 18.7.4 and replace it with something like "... location of utilities (including the roading networks) to recognise important landscapes features, views, elements and patterns of the local surroundings and thus avoiding..."
378	27	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	Policy 18.7.4 should be amended for clarity and to require utilities to be buried (rather than where practicable).	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	25	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	Policy 18.7.4 should be amended to reflect rule 10.11.3 which relates to the undergrounding of Network Utilities within OLAs.	Amend policy 18.7.4 and associated explanation as suggested within the submission, removing "where practicable" and adding "requiring".
451	27	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	In Part	Policy 18.7.4 should be amended for clarity and to require utilities to be buried (rather than where practicable).	Amend with wording provided by submitter.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	16	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Oppose	Policy 18.7.4 is considered unnecessary. The methods described in Policy 18.7.4 could be incorporated into the Explanations of Policies 18.7.1 and 18.7.2	Policy 18.7.4 should be deleted. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
499	7	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 18.7.4.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.4 is amended to read as: 'Encouraging subdivision boundaries and the alignment and location of utilities (including roading networks) to reflect the existing patterns of the landscape where technically and economically practicable and thus avoiding and mitigating potential adverse effects on landscape values' or words to that effect or this policy be deleted in its entirety.
598[499]	7	Stuart, Helen	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/7.	Disallow submission 499/7.
560[499]	7	Stuart, Ian William	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/7.	Disallow submission 499/7.
517	7	Transpower NZ Ltd : Lacey, Kathryn :	Policy	Policy 18.7.4	Support	The submitter supports Policy 18.7.4.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.4 is retained.
283	35	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Clarify the appropriateness and practical application of Policy 18.7.3. Incentives suggested are not satisfactory compensation for landowners.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly.
378	28	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	In Part	Policy 18.7.5 should be amended for clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
395	8	Calveley, C	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Misleading as OLAs are mostly on private land. No incentive in development opportunity to encourage a landowner to enhance an OLA.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Policy, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	39	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	8	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Misleading as most OLAs are on private land. No incentive in development opportunity to encourage a landowner to enhance an OLA.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend or delete the Policy, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[396]	53	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	26	Hawley, Catherine and John	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	In Part	Policy 18.7.5 needs minor amendment.	Amend policy 18.7.5 by replacing 'protection' with 'enhancement' in the policy itself.
407	8	Nickolson, Dave	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Oppose Policy 18.7.5 as it does not provide sufficient financial incentives to motivate submitter to improve their property for the benefit of others. Alternative measures are not recognised as offsetting the effects of development.	Recognise alternative measures as a means as offsetting the effects of development.
450	8	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Oppose Policy 18.7.5 as it does not provide sufficient financial incentives to motivate submitter to improve their property for the benefit of others. Alternative measures are not recognised as offsetting the effects of development.	Recognise alternative measures as a means as offsetting the effects of development.
451	28	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	In Part	Policy 18.7.5 should be amended for clarity.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
453	12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	In Part	The submitter supports in part Policy 18.7.5.	The submitter seeks that Policy 18.7.5 is amended to seek maintenance or enhancement of landscapes (not just restoration).
492	8	Grierson, Monique	Policy	Policy 18.7.5	Oppose	Oppose Policy 18.7.5 as it does not provide sufficient financial incentives to motivate submitter to improve their property for the benefit of others. Alternative measures are not recognised as offsetting the effects of development.	Recognise alternative measures as a means as offsetting the effects of development.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
100	1	Ballard, Helen	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[100]	227	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 100/1	Allow submission 100/1
101	1	Robinson, Raelene	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[101]	72	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 101/1	Allow submission 101/1
102	1	Hacker, Shaun	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[102]	268	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 102/1	Allow submission 102/1
103	1	Cooper-Davies, Peter	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[103]	89	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 103/1	Allow submission 103/1
104	1	Heggie, Alastair	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[104]	116	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 104/1	Allow submission 104/1
105	1	Laker, Colin	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[105]	33	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 105/1	Allow submission 150/1
106	1	Seddon, David	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[106]	110	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 160/1	Allow submission 106/1
108	1	Hodges, Richard Donald	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[108]	179	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 108/1	Allow submission 108/1
109	1	Kerrigan, Graham	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[109]	187	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 109/1	Allow submission 109/1
110	1	Hogan, Jonathon	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
111	1	Michael, Joe	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[111]	95	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 111/1	Allow submission 111/1
112	1	Allan, David	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[112]	221	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 112/1	Allow submission 112/1
113	1	Miller, Todd	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[113]	42	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 113/1	Allow submission 113/1
114	1	Cooke, David	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[114]	159	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 114/1	Allow submission 114/1
115	1	Ovesen, Vicki	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[115]	37	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 115/1	Allow submission 115/1
116	1	Smith, Georgie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[116]	174	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 116/1	Allow submission 116/1
117	1	Van Rooyen, Steph	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[117]	256	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 117/1	Allow submission 117/1
120	1	Sommerville, Carolyn Louise	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[120]	211	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 120/1	Allow submission 120/1
121	1	Torr, Anna	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[121]	108	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 121/1	Allow submission 121/1
122	1	Torr, Craig	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[122]	1	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 122/1	Allow submission 122/1
125	1	Hargrave, Patricia Rachel Constance	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
125	2	Hargrave, Patricia Rachel Constance	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes imposition of regulation on Bald Rock property.	Remove OLA from Bald Rock property.
127	1	Reddy, Adrian	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[127]	17	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 127/1	Allow submission 127/1
129	1	Underwood, Rayma	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[129]	126	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 129/1	Allow submission 129/1
130	1	Underwood, E C	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[130]	130	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 130/1	Allow submission 130/1
131	1	Wattam, Eleanor Jean	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[131]	52	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Supports submission 131/1	Allow submission 131/1
131	3	Wattam, Eleanor Jean	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes property owners opposing the reactivation of a quarry that was established before the nearby houses were constructed.	No decision sought
132	1	Wilson, Peter and Liliam	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[132]	282	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 132/1	Allow submission 132/1
133	1	Wattan, Stan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[133]	50	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 133/1	Allow submission 133/1
135	1	Christie, Nellie Maude	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[135]	300	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 135/1	Allow submission 135/1
136	1	Kehely, Trevor	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[136]	305	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 136/1	Allow submission 136/1
137	1	Dalbeth, Valerie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
140	1	Hosking, Estelle	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[140]	181	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 140/1	Allow submission 140/1
141	1	Wattam, Eleanor and Stanton	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
142	1	Murray, Reade Patrick	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
143	1	Steiner, Marjory and Frank	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
147	1	Engeler, George	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
153	1	Calmore-Williams, Darrell John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
154	3	Taylor, Joan Eva	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
155	1	Davey, Deborah	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[155]	31	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 155/1	Allow submission 155/1
157	1	Furze, Peter	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[157]	203	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 157/1	Allow submission 157/1
158	1	Keay, D G	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[158]	98	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 158/1	Allow submission 158/1
159	1	Hales, Des	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[159]	44	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 159/1	Allow submission 159/1
160	1	Hales, Renee	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[160]	276	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 160/1	Allow submission 160/1
161	1	Keay, Jocelyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[161]	193	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 161/1	Allow submission 161/1
163	1	Hales, G and J	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[163]	284	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 163/1	Allow submission 163/1
164	1	Clarry, Kevin George	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[164]	316	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 164/1	Allow submission 164/1
165	1	Furze, Merrill	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[165]	217	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 165/1	Allow submission 165/1
166	1	Gillatt, Roger and Barbara	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
168	1	Watson, Michael Alexander Claude	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[168]	197	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 168/1	Allow submission 168/1
169	1	Mulherm, M E	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
170	1	Hadlow, C L	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
171	1	Oceanview Mahuta Ltd : Hadlow, Pat :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
173	1	Sills, Val Winston	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
174	2	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes the decrease in property rights that will occur with their property being included in OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach. Stewardship demonstrates no additional management needed.	The submitter seeks that OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach will not apply to any private land
174	3	Mahuta Community Water Supply Association Ltd : Sills, V W :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
176	1	Jones, Graham Laurence	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
18	1	Chambers, Delwyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[18]	288	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 18/1	Allow submission 18/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
185	2	Bloxwich, Sharon Elizabeth	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
187	1	Ward, Natalie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[187]	122	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 187/1	Allow submission 187/1
190	3	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
191	2	Onewa Estate Limited : Robinson, Terry :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Chapter 18 renders land incapable of reasonable use per s85(2) of the RMA.	Compensation offered to landowners affected by the Parahi Scenic Reserve designation.
19	1	Leaf, Julia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[19]	290	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 19/1	Allow submission 19/1
196	1	O'Connor, Helen Beatrice	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[196]	307	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 196/1	Allow submission 196/1
197	1	O'Connor, Alwyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[197]	191	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 197/1	Allow submission 197/1
204	1	Musgrave, Brigette	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[204]	294	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 204/1	Allow submission 204/1
205	1	Paton, Barry	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[205]	310	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 205/1	Allow submission 205/1
206	1	Rogers, Roy John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[206]	155	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 206/1	Allow submission 206/1
207	1	Paton, A H	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[207]	161	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 207/1	Allow submission 207/1
208	1	Rodgers, Neil and Sarah	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[208]	157	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 208/1	Allow submission 208/1
209	1	Underwood, Steven E	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[209]	292	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 209/1	Allow submission 209/1
210	1	Underwood, Francesca	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[210]	112	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 210/1	Allow submission 210/1
211	1	Willcox, Peter	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[211]	85	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 211/1	Allow submission 211/1
21	1	Morris, Kay	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[21]	286	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 21/1	Allow submission 21/1
212	1	Willcox, Rita	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[212]	74	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 212/1	Allow submission 212/1
213	1	Donaldson, Craig	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[213]	213	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 213/1	Allow submission 213/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
214	1	Whitburn, Robyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[214]	172	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 214/1	Allow submission 214/1
215	1	Aislabie, Jessica	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[215]	39	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 215/1	Allow submission 215/1
216	1	Parker, Scott	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[216]	83	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 216/1	Allow submission 216/1
217	1	Underwood, P R	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[217]	201	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 217/1	Allow submission 217/1
218	1	Brown, Brenda	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[218]	132	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 218/1	Allow submission 218/1
219	1	de Graaf, Adrianus	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[219]	303	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 219/1	Allow submission 219/1
220	1	de Graaf, Josina	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[220]	185	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 220/1	Allow submission 220/1
221	1	Underwood, Karla	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[221]	153	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 221/1	Allow submission 221/1
22	1	Rowe, Graeme and Pam	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of farmland in the Variation 1 - Landscapes.	Existing farmland be excluded from the Variation 1 - Landscapes.
222	1	Loftus, Beverly	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[222]	298	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 222/1	Allow submission 222/1
223	1	Howse, Catarina	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[223]	313	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 223/1	Allow submission 223/1
224	1	Howse, Bryan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[224]	248	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 224/1	Allow submission 224/1
225	1	Howse, Stephanie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[225]	296	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 225/1	Allow submission 225/1
226	1	Waetford, Dezarae	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[226]	205	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 226/1	Allow submission 226/1
227	1	Underwood, Troy	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[227]	260	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 227/1	Allow submission 227/1
229	1	Bunting, Penelope Ann	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land including onerous consent requirements, increased costs and uncompensated decreases in property value. management of private land should be left to landowners.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
231	3	Kelly, June	Property Rights	None	Oppose	There should be no impact on private land as the economic costs are too great.	No decision sought.
23	1	Coates Foote, Beatrice	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[23]	60	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 23/1	Allow submission 23/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
235	1	Forrest, Logan James	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
239	2	Russell, Keith Ernest	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. OLAs and VALs should only be on Crown land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
24	1	Harfoot, Cynthia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[24]	54	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 24/1	Allow submission 24/1
244	3	Maude, Cynthia Joy	Property Rights	None	In Part	Property values affected where large portions of land are included in OLAs.	OLAs should exclude private property.
245	1	Legarth, Larson	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Variation will negatively impact growth and the future viability of farming the property. This will in turn affect the whole economy.	Compensate for loss of income and decreased capital value of land, or exclude property from OLAs. Additional consultation also sought.
245	3	Legarth, Larson	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
246	1	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes VAL being placed on privately owned land. Concern it will have adverse financial impact and will usurp private property rights without compensation. Regulation will render land incapable of reasonable management, which land has been subject to for last 99 years.	Delete VAL notation from the property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
246	2	Legarth, F J (John) and Marlen	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
250	1	Rogers, Nona	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	No decision sought.
604[250]	142	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 250/1	Allow submission 250/1
250	3	Rogers, Nona	Property Rights	None	Oppose	It is theft for the Council to take control of privately owned land without payment.	No decision sought.
604[250]	144	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 250/3	Allow submission 250/3
252	1	Howell, Michael	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[252]	189	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 252/1	Allow submission 252/1
254	5	Greville, John Willis	Property Rights	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the restrictions on building dwellings and structures within OLA areas	Apply permitted activity status to activities associated with farming, including earthworks, dwellings and structures
259	1	Graham Leonard Hawkes, Robert G McLennan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
26	1	Harfoot, Christopher	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[26]	258	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 26/1	Allow submission 26/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
263	1	Draper, William	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. Restricts economic choices of a landowner, reduces property values and is a miscarriage of natural justice.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
264	1	Fernandez, Jenni	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
265	2	Fernandez, Blodwen	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The Plan assures protection of private property rights without huge costs. VAL notation offers no extra landscape protection, just additional cost.	Remove reference to VALs or exclude VAL notation from private land.
273	1	Sidwell, Penelope Mae	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
274	1	Poole, Raymond George	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
276	1	Robinson, Perrin	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
278	1	Miller, James Wynard	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
279	1	Miller, Shirley Dawn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
280	1	Donaldson, Douglas and Lenore	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
281	1	Drinnan, Stephen Rex	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
282	1	Kaipara Citizens and Ratepayers Association : Mortensen, Allan :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
28	1	Pettit, Martyn Charles	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Oppose OLAs as this will restrict rights of freehold land.	"Why"
283	108	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Proposed Variation 1 renders land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Private property owners should be left to manage their own land

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
284	1	Andrew, L J and N E	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
285	1	Lupton, Ian Christopher	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
286	4	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
287	1	MacLean, Angus	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. Amounts to theft of private land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary. Alternatively fund consents required to work in these OLAs.
288	1	Jeffs Family Trust : Jeff, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
289	1	Guest, W J and N M	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
293	1	Lulich, Leonard S	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
294	1	Williamson, Robert John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
295	1	Brown, Stuart WJ	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
296	1	Woodcock, Rodney	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
612[296]	1	Woodcock, Rodney	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 296/1.	Disallow submission 296/1.
297	1	Underwood, Steven and Francesca	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
298	1	Windy Hill Family Trust : Cotton, Graeme :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
300	1	Stopher, Allan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
301	1	Manson, Ngaire Mirabel	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
302	1	Howard, Marie Hazel	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
303	1	Schmist-Sapiatzer, Sabine	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
304	1	Sapiatzer, Peter	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land as an almost 'communist' control. Council previously committed an 'environmental crime' in chopping down trees in the Kai Iwi lakes area in the name of cost-effectiveness. It renders private land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
305	1	Tregidga, Reginald Charles	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
306	1	Walker, John and Sjannie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
307	1	Linder Downs Ltd : Vallance, K F and D R :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
308	1	Bull, Jospeh Arthur	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
309	1	Ulrich, Lorraine Tereza	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
310	1	Savage, Keith and Velma	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
311	1	Midgley, Steve and Lynette	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
312	1	Midgley, Tyron and Sarah	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
313	1	Wordsworth, Stanley James	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
314	1	Puoto Farms Ltd : Maree Jones, Simon Woodcock :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
316	1	Hardy, Isabell	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
317	1	House, Stuart Henderson	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
318	1	van den Bogaart, Cecelia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
319	1	Otway, Brian Kay	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
320	1	Harrison, Donald Joseph	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. Land is devalued e.g. Harrison Farms, Kai Iwi Lakes. Questions foreshore ownership and rights.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
321	1	Smith, Kevin and Marilyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
322	1	Crawford, Morag Seonaid	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
32	1	Stratford, G.	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[32]	176	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 32/1	Allow submission 32/1
323	1	Kemp, Harry	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
324	1	Subritzky, Desmond	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
326	1	Appleton, Gordon George	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
327	1	Bennett, Kawyn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
328	1	Reed, Douglas	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
329	1	Murphy, Denise-Gae	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
3	1	Sellars, Chris	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
3	9	Sellars, Chris	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes restrictions on property rights	The submitter seeks that OLA's do not apply to privately owned land

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
330	1	Taurua, Bernice	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
331	1	Iona Farms Ltd : Bray, K :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
332	1	Ludvigson, Tanya	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
332	3	Ludvigson, Tanya	Property Rights	None	N/A	The definition of OLA on privately owned land is too subjective.	No decision sought
33	1	O'Conner, Erin	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[33]	138	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 33/1	Allow submission 33/1
334	1	Harfoot, Tracey Ellice	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[334]	264	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 334/1	Allow submission 334/1
335	1	McCarthy, Douglas James and Neto Barbara	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
336	1	Robinson, Derek and Patricia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
337	1	Ruiterman, A T	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
338	1	Linton, David	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. It extinguishes property rights, freedoms and privileges guaranteed in a free society.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
339	1	Davies, Rhys John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
340	2	Fisher, P R	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Interference with landowners' right to enjoy their property.	Not stated.
341	1	Ballantyne, I K	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
342	1	Parsons, Eric and Jillian	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
343	1	Martin, Graeme and Trudi-Anne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
34	1	Dick, Fiona	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[34]	266	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 34/1	Allow submission 34/1
345	1	Tantrum, Trevor and Avirl	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
347	1	Gatti, Susan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
348	1	Tutamoe Farm Trust : Morris, Bruce J :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
349	1	Williams, Murray	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
350	1	Neverfail Family Trust : Gail Adrienne Clack, Harold McLean Hilliam :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
351	1	Lees, Tom	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
352	1	Donegan, Julia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
353	1	Hetherington, Desmond Wayne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
35	1	Dick, Laura	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[35]	270	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 35/1	Allow submission 35/1
354	1	Godfrey, Ian Rex	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
355	1	Lardner, Michael and Beverley	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
356	1	Appleton, Lester Winston	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
357	1	Reid, R T S	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
358	1	He, Lisa	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
360	1	O'Sullivan, Paul	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[360]	25	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 360/1	Allow submission 360/1
361	1	Lusty, David James	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
362	1	Hargreaves, David and Mary	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
363	1	Vallance, John And Cathy	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
36	1	Dick, Alison	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[36]	68	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 36/1	Allow submission 36/1
364	1	Warnes, Stuart	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
365	1	Wood, Steven and Susan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
366	1	McEvoy, R J and A	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
367	1	Wilkinson, Peter and Dawn	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
368	1	Robinson, Asa	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
369	1	Lisa Sellar, Aaron de lange	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
370	1	Brown, Aland and Judith	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
37	1	Dick, Anna	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[37]	246	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 37/1	Allow submission 37/1
379	3	Roadley, Rex	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Appendix C enables the Council to steal property rights without consultation.	Consult with affected farmers and exclude neighbouring farmers or those with a view from Appendix 18c's scope.
381	1	Ward, Allison Anne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
383	3	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Property Rights	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the greater restrictions imposed on land owners by Variation 1 - Landscapes.	No decision sought.
38	1	Dick, Phillip	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[38]	56	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 38/1	Allow submission 38/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
387	1	Anglesea Consulting Ltd : Edwards, Graeme :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. This burden is greater than any public benefit and an unjustified compromise of property rights.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
388	1	Ross, Angus and Sharon	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
389	1	Malam, Anne Marie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
390	3	Heywood, Anne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	OLAs restrict land use rights.	Delete the Variation in entirety, or remove Baylys Beach from OLA 2, or remove settlement areas in identified gorges from OLA 2.
392	1	Anderson, Audrey	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
39	1	Young, Jennifer Margaret	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[39]	62	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 39/1	Allow submission 39/1
398	1	Waring, Chris and Lorrain	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Excessive regulation and control by a small group of people/companies over private property preventing development.	Delete Variation in entirety.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
399	1	Ward, Chris	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
400	1	Underwood, Christine	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[400]	229	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 400/1	Allow submission 400/1
402	1	Knox, Colin	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Variation contradicts private property rights. In particular the freedom to manage, modify, improve and change property.	Delete VALs and any reference to such landscapes in the Variation.
40	3	Rogers, Eileen Valarie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[40]	223	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 40/1	Allow submission 40/1
404	1	Sidwell, Craig	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
407	4	Nickolson, Dave	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The OLA notation will have implications on the submitter's property and the ability to use or develop the property in the future.	Remove the OLA notation from the property or amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2 and 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
409	1	Thomson, David Ronald	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Submitter opposes rules and regulations concerning private land.	Submitter seeks removing all mention of Outstanding Landscapes from all private property.
410	1	Lau, Diana	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[410]	15	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 410/1	Allow submission 410/1
412	1	Robinson, Derek	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Submitter opposes Chapter 18	The submitter requests that OLA's and VAL's be removed so that the management of private land is left to landowners

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
413	1	Hardie-Neil, D J	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[413]	252	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 413/1	Allow submission 413/1
414	1	Green, Donna	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
416	1	Blitvic, Dwayne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
417	1	Underwood, Dwayne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[417]	225	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 417/1	Allow submission 417/1
418	3	Wills, Edward	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
420	1	O'Sullivan, Emma	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[420]	124	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 420/1	Allow submission 420/1
421	1	Underwood, Emily	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[421]	166	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 421/1	Allow submission 421/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
422	1	Blitvic, Elaine	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
424	1	Dix, Elizabeth Anne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
428	1	Hooker, Gary	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
430	2	Fish, Isabel	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
43	1	Gunnery, Lisa	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[43]	164	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 43/1	Allow submission 43/1
434	1	O'Connor, Huw	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[434]	48	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 434/1	Allow submission 434/1
435	1	Underwood, Harley	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[435]	87	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 435/1	Allow submission 435/1
437	1	Fletcher, Ian	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[437]	104	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 437/1	Allow submission 437/1
438	5	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their land being included in the additional Assessment Criteria.	They should be responsible for governance and management of this land.
589[438]	17	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
439	1	Anderson, Innes McRae	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
440	1	Blitvic, Ivan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
443	1	Dalbeth, Joanne Gay	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
44	1	Hardie Neil, Jonathan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[44]	168	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 44/1	Allow submission 44/1
450	4	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The OLA notation will have implications on the submitter's property and the ability to use or develop the property in the future.	Remove the OLA notation from the property or amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2 and 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
45	1	Hardie Neil, Alistair	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[45]	102	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 45/1	Allow submission 45/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
458	9	Anderson, John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to proposed Variation 1 - Landscapes because of restrictions on property rights.	The submitter seeks that Council purchase those properties that it highlights as needing protection.
459	8	Bull, John R L	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The variation is no more than a grab at property owner's rights.	KDC to buy property and manage it according to their ideas.
459	11	Bull, John R L	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Farming will no longer be a permitted activity as most normal farming activities will require resource consent.	No decision sought.
46	1	Neil, Sue	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[46]	64	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 46/1	Allow submission 46/1
469	1	Christopher Alver, Kerry Lee Turek	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
473	1	Harfoot, Kieran Gibbs	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[473]	5	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 473/1	Allow submission 473/1
47	1	Hardie Neil, Anna	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[47]	278	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 47/1	Allow submission 47/1
477	1	Davey, Louanne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
482	3	Gash, Mark William	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Landowners should be compensated for loss of property rights.	Compensated landowners for breach of property rights.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
483	1	Baines, Martin Hamer	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
48	1	Hardie Neil, David	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[48]	207	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 48/1	Allow submission 48/1
488	1	Beatty, Michael and Jan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	OLAs undermine private property rights of landowners.	Exclude OLAs and VALs from privately owned land unless consulted with and granted consent from landowner. Landowner to have the right to decline the provision of an OLA or VAL on their property.
491	1	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
491	9	Murray, Moengaroa Sharon	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Areas of - Waipoua Forest- West Coast Ocean Beach- Kaihu Forest- Pukewharariki- Maunganui Bluff- Ahikiwi Bush- Ngakiriparauri Stream Bush- Kai-iwi Lakes- Maungaraho- Tokatoka- Donnelly's Crossing Bush South- Marlborough Road Bush- Maunganui Bluff Bush fringes- Muriwai Stream wetlands- Tutamoe, Kaihu, Marlborough Forest fringes- Waipoua Forest fringes are in the Te Roroa area of interest and many are included in the Treaty Settlement zones. Since the Landscape Technical Report was completed almost six years ago, Te Roroa have freehold title to some of the places listed above.	Do not want Council to dictate the value and use of their land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
492	4	Grierson, Monique	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The OLA notation will have implications on the submitter's property and the ability to use or develop the property in the future.	Remove the OLA notation from the property or amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2 and 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
49	1	Hardie Neil, Timothy	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[49]	114	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 49/1	Allow submission 49/1
500	5	Legarth, Olivia	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Proposed Rules interfere with private landowners' reasonable use and enjoyment of their land, especially where applicable to farmland.	Exclude all farmland from OLAs and VALs.
502	1	Halse, Robyne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
504	1	Dix, Trevor Quintin	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
50	1	Hardie Neil, Jenneane	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[50]	209	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 50/1	Allow submission 50/1
506	1	Davis Paniora, Sonya Blitvic	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
508	2	Theobald, Stephen John	Property Rights	None	In Part	The Variation should trace the boundaries of existing freehold sections as compromises property rights.	Variation to exclude private property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
510	1	Fish, Terence Henry	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
514	1	Te Uri o Hau Incorporated : Wright, Rawson :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
51	1	Hardie Neil, Bruce John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[51]	272	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 51/1	Allow submission 51/1
515	7	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the OLA and VAL designations will interfere with private property and possibly render property incapable of reasonable use.	The submitter seeks that OLA's and VAL's should only be considered when they can be demonstrated not to inflict monetary or economic loss on private landowners, including Iwi. For that reason Te Roroa believes that those designations should be confined only to land held for public purposes.
515	12	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes OLA's and VAL's.	The submitter seeks that all OLA's and VAL's are removed from privately owned property.
518	1	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of Chapter 18 in relation to their property (being OLA 15 Bald Rock). It would render the land as incapable of reasonable use.	Remove OLA 15 from the Variation.
518	4	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	Including OLA 15 in the District Plan will compromise the ability for the Thomas Coates Estate Trustees to provide for their economic and social wellbeing. This contravenes KDC's values.	The Trustees strongly refute the inclusion of OLA 15 in the District Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
518	6	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	OLA 15 - Bald Rock	Oppose	There is a demonstrated and proven use of the property for quarrying purposes. Including OLA 15 in the District Plan compromises the ability of Baldrock Estate to be used in this way in the future.	Baldrock Estate demonstrates unique characteristics to warrant its exclusion from the OLA register without compromising the intent of Variation 1.
521	1	Ward, Wayne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	OLAs and VALs will render private property incapable of reasonable use.	Withdraw the Plan and renotify as a draft plan or review the plan for the current.
524	1	Fletcher, Yvonne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[524]	147	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 524/1	Allow submission 524/1
52	1	Kay, Fay	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[52]	21	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 52/1	Allows submission 52/1
525	2	Bowring, Ian and Glenda	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Submitter's property, within a VAL, is of visual amenity due to their careful management of the land. Variation would restrict land use and management.	Remove VAL from our land (Lot 1 DP 197211).
526	4	Goulding, Timothy	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
531	1	Causer, Gary C	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[531]	120	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 531/1	Allow submission 531/1
534	1	Neale, Richard	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[534]	3	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 534/1	Allow submission 534/1
53	1	Paterson, Scott	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[53]	93	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 53/1	Allow submission 53/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
535	1	Drake, Rachel Lucy Caughey	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[535]	23	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 535/1	Allow submission 535/1
536	1	Drake, Libby	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[536]	151	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 536/1	Allow submission 536/1
537	1	Drake, Bridget Elizabeth Caughey	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[537]	280	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 537/1	Allow submission 537/1
544	1	Gledhill, Charles	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[544]	70	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 544/1	Allow submission 544/1
54	1	Paterson, Varina	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[54]	149	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 54/1	Allow submission 54/1
545	1	Causer, Lynne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[545]	250	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 545/1	Allow submission 545/1
546	1	Latimer, Barry Thomas	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[546]	81	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 546/1	Allow submission 546/1
547	1	Schultz, Ralph Fredrick	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[547]	195	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 547/1	Allow submission 547/1
548	1	Sands, Phill	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[548]	13	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 548/1	Allow submission 548/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
549	1	Schultz, Jennie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[549]	183	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 549/1	Allow submission 549/1
550	1	Schultz, Ben	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[550]	29	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 550/1	Allow submission 550/1
551	1	Schultz, L A	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[551]	9	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Supports submission 551/1	Allow submission 551/1
553	1	Paterson, CR and CL	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
55	1	Paterson, Ken	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[55]	140	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 55/1	Allow submission 55/1
555	1	Carter, W M	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land. Compensation should be paid for loss of property rights.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
56	1	Paterson, Carol Lynne	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[56]	134	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 56/1	Allow submission 56/1
57	1	Paterson, Cam	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[57]	254	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 57/1	Allow submission 57/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
62	1	Coates, Arthur Eric	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[62]	79	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 62/1	Allow submission 62/1
64	1	Sommerville, Marcus	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[64]	100	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 64/1	Allow submission 64/1
65	1	Caughy, Lucy	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[65]	58	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 65/1	Allow submission 65/1
70	2	Smith, Edward John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter seeks the right to take wood from his property (i.e. firewood).	The submitter seeks that council make forestry a permitted activity.
575[70]	16	Hawley, Catherine and John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/2.	Submission 70/2 be disallowed.
576[70]	16	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes submission 70/2	Disallow submission 70/2
70	5	Smith, Edward John	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
72	1	Tawharu, Anna	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[72]	77	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 72/1	Allow submission 72/1
73	1	Millar, Jessie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[73]	19	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 73/1	Allow submission 73/1
74	1	Dyer, Murray	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[74]	91	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 74/1	Allow submission 74/1
75	1	Salvigny, Gary	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[75]	136	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 75/1	Allow submission 75/1
76	1	Evelyn Salvigny :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[76]	274	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 76/1	Allow submission 76/1
7	1	Hancock Forest Management NZ : Buckingham, Ursula :	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the classification of land in such a way that constrains the current use of the land	The submitter requests removing production forestry (their land) from OLA's.
589[7]	77	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 7/1.	Accept submission 7/1.
77	1	Rimmer, Bernie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[77]	231	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 77/1	Allow submission 77/1
78	1	Rimmer, Glennis	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[78]	46	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 78/1	Allow submission 78/1
79	1	Cooper, Wendy L.	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[79]	11	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 79/1	Allow submission 79/1
80	1	Young, Rebecca Diana	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[80]	262	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 80/1	Allow submission 80/1
82	1	Salvigny, Brian	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[82]	35	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 82/1	Allow submission 82/1
83	1	Beach Caughey, Elizabeth	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[83]	170	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 83/1	Allow submission 83/1
84	1	Caughey, David E.	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[84]	118	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 84/1	Allow submission 84/1
85	1	McQuinlan, Katrina	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[85]	7	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 85/1	Allow submission 85/1
86	1	McConnell, Judith Mary	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[86]	27	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 86/1	Allow submission 86/1
87	1	McConnell, Alfred William	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[87]	215	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 87/1	Allow submission 87/1
8	1	Underwood, Kenneth	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes the infringement of their property rights and seeks the money be spent on roads instead.	No decision sought
604[8]	234	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 8/1	Allow submission 8/1
8	2	Underwood, Kenneth	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
604[8]	235	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 8/2	Allow submission 8/2
8	10	Underwood, Kenneth	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[8]	243	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 8/10	Allow submission 8/10
88	1	Underwood, Kendon	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[88]	66	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 88/1	Allow submission 88/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
92	3	Bishop, Robert Alan	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
93	1	Mannix, Mike	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[93]	106	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 93/1	Allow submission 93/1
94	1	Mannix, Valerie	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[94]	128	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 94/1	Allow submission 94/1
95	1	Staff, Linda	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.
604[95]	199	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 95/1	Allow submission 95/1
96	1	Russell, Ian	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
97	1	Hindrup, Ray	Property Rights	None	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to private land being included in the landscapes chapters	The submitter seeks that private land is excluded from the Kaipara District Plan
97	2	Hindrup, Ray	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land. It renders that land incapable of reasonable use and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on any person having an interest in that land.	Exclude the OLA notation from all private property. Consequential amendments shall be made to the relevant planning maps as necessary.
98	1	Bishop, Julie Maria	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Variation is too vague and broad. Takes away property rights and will devalue property without compensation.	Amend OLAs to exclude private property and undertake consequential amendments to the planning maps and remove all references to VALs from the Plan.
99	1	Ballard, Luke	Property Rights	None	Oppose	Opposes OLAs and VALs being placed on privately owned land.	OLAs and VALs to be removed from privately owned land.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
604[99]	145	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Property Rights	None	Support	Supports submission 99/1	Allow submission 99/1

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	7	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	In Part	Add a new paragraph between section 6 and 7 to provide an explanation for clarity.	Include wording provided by submitter.
378	8	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	In Part	Amend paragraph 3 in Section 18.2 for clarity and accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
397	5	Hawley, Catherine and John	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	In Part	There is no explanation of what is considered 'inappropriate' to assist in assessments.	Insert an interpretation or explanation between section 6 and section 7 paragraphs in section 18.2 with wording supplied within the submission.
451	7	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	In Part	Add a new paragraph between section 6 and 7 to provide an explanation for clarity.	Include wording provided by submitter.
451	8	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	In Part	Amend paragraph 3 in Section 18.2 for clarity and accuracy.	Amend with wording provided by submitter.
486	7	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	N/A	Section 18.2 needs to be more explicit in noting that the OLAs and VALs identified in Chapter 18 have been assessed and determined in terms of s6(a) and (b) of the RMA and the NZCPS 1994 and section 7 and 8 of the NRC Regional Coastal Plan for Northland 1994.	Amend Section 18.2 with the wording provided by the submitter. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
589[486]	8	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Resource Management Act Requirements - 18.2	None	Support	Supports submission 486/7.	Accept submission 486/7.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
470	2	Ball, Kevin Wilfred	Rules	12.10.3	Oppose	4ha is a lot of land. Increase will restrict growth and Council income.	Retain rule. Submission unclear.
405	6	Shearer, Craig	Rules	12.10.3(h)	In Part	The submitter supports in part Performance Standard 12.10.3(h).	The submitter requests that Performance Standard 12.10.3(h) be amended from: 'h) It is not visible from a public viewing point on a public road, public reserve, the foreshore or CMA that is within 500m2 of that building; and' To read as follows: 'h) It is not visible from a public viewing point on a public road, public reserve, the foreshore or CMA that is within one kilometre of that building; and'
283	64	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 12.10.18 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	65	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (x) of Rule 12.10.19 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (x).
283	66	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xvi) of Rule 12.10.20 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xvi).
283	67	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiv) of Rule 12.10.21 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiv).
283	68	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiii) of Rule 12.10.22 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii).
283	69	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	It is unclear why rule 12.12.3 has been amended to exclude OLAs. There is no rule which provides for boundary adjustments with an OLA.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii). Retain existing rule and delete reference to OLAs.
283	87	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Building coverage is not provided for by Rule 13.10.14.	Clarify how building coverage is provided for.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	90	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xvi) of Rule 13.10.22 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xvi).
283	91	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiv) of Rule 13.10.23 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiv).
283	92	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiii) of Rule 13.10.24 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii).
373	17	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Signage rules are opposed. The majority of land administered by the Department of Conservation is identified as OLAs. The department requires signage (temporary and permanent) to inform the public.	Amend rules 12.10.24(d) and 15A.10.24(d) to read: "any sign that does not meet performance standard b) and is not within an Outstanding Landscapes, as identified in Map Series 1".
378	56	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.23 - Signage.	No decision sought.
397	67	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Bulk and Location	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.23 - Signage.	No decision sought.
442	3	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions	The submitter seeks restrictions on building colour.
599[442]	4	Stuart, Helen	Rules	Bulk and Location	Support	Supports submission 442/3.	Allow submission 442/3.
442	4	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions.	The submitter seeks that structures are made to be visually compatible with the environment.
599[442]	5	Stuart, Helen	Rules	Bulk and Location	Support	Supports submission 442/4.	Allow submission 442/4.
444	12	Elliott, Jan	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 12.10.3.	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.10.3 is amended so that the height restriction is not more than 5m.
451	56	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.23 - Signage.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
452	11	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Rules	Bulk and Location	N/A	It may be appropriate to provide for commercial or industrial buildings within an OLA. These should not be provided for as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Amendment to Rules so that any commercial or industrial building in an OLA is a Discretionary Activity.
463	4	Kaipara District Council :	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	The submitter states that the Note 1 may not apply to all the rules it is attached to.	The submitter seeks that a review is carried out to ascertain whether Note 1 (attached to Rules 12.10.4, 12.10.5, 12.10.6 and 12.10.12 is accurate or whether parts of these rules need to be retained or incorporated into the new Rule 12.10.3.
464	26	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Rules 12.10.24d and 15B.10.24d are inconsistent with the description in 18.5.2.	Remove 12.10.24d and 15B.10.24d.
466	1	Rountree, Kelvin Bruce	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	The submitter disagrees with Rule 12.10.3(b.) and states that 50 square metres gross floor area is too small for a dwelling.	The submitter seeks that the wording of Rule 12.10.3(b.) be amended to read as follows: '(b) Does not exceed 200m2 gross floor area; and'
484	37	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Opposes 8m height limit for dwellings in OLAs as this will not adequately protect OLAs.	Limit the height limit of dwellings in OLAs to 5m.
484	39	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	Bulk and Location	In Part	Support strict bulk and location conditions to apply to OLAs such as single level structures, restrictions on colour and reflectivity of building materials, visual compatibility with environment and surroundings, unobtrusive infrastructure (such as power poles, access, driveways).	No decision sought
500	9	Legarth, Olivia	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 restricts farmers' ability to erect and alter structures necessary for normal farming activities including water tanks, pumps, troughs, barns, sheds and fences.	Amend 12.10.3 where it relates to farmland, regardless of whether that farmland is classified as an OLA or VAL.
500	10	Legarth, Olivia	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	The definition of 'structure' in Chapter 9.129 restricts farmers' ability to erect and alter structures necessary for normal farming activities including water tanks, pumps, troughs, barns, sheds and fences.	Amend definition of 'structure' so not to include structures necessary for normal farming activities.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
71	2	Cullen, Bruce Trevor	Rules	Bulk and Location	Oppose	Opposes Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2 and 12.10.3 because it restricts the use of land.	Amend the boundary of OLA 13 and Appendix 18B. Map number 13 should be amended to exclude DP 61490 - NA19A/322 (Boarhill)
123	2	Grove, Peter	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Rule 13.10.3 - 20% extension to a building with only 40m2 is neither practicable nor economical.	Insert: (e) Any alteration/additions to a dwelling or structure under 50m2 floor area must not exceed 75% of the gross floor area of the dwelling or 75% of the volume of the structure.
151	1	Browns Road Trust : Hood, Brent :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Rule 12.10.3 contains ambiguity.	Amend wording of Rule 12.10.3 (b) and (d)-(i) as specified to allow for construction and alteration of buildings in OLAs as permitted activities when within an approved envelope.
151	2	Browns Road Trust : Hood, Brent :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Where a building envelope approved as part of an existing land use or subdivision consent falls within an OLA, construction and alteration of dwellings/structures should be permitted under Rule 12.20.3.	Amend Rule 12.10.3(b) and (d)-(h) as specified to allow for construction and alteration of buildings in OLAs as permitted activities when within an approved envelope.
156	2	Leabourn, Maxwell Charles	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Opposes Rule 13.10.3 (b), (e), and (h) as the provisions are restrictive and can affect the value of their properties	Delete these provisions.
156	4	Leabourn, Maxwell Charles	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Opposes proposed Rule 13.10.4 because it will make their property less valuable through excessive restrictions.	Delete Rule 13.10.4.
16	1	Neil, Robyn Patricia	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Opposes Rule 13.10.3 being applied to 51 Marine Parade (within OLA 2).	Remove OLA from 51 Marine Parade.
20	2	Hensman, Peter	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Two huts constructed onsite.	Retain availability to construct a building onsite and not prevent use of the property as a non-permanent residence
2	1	James Tetuhi :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Seeks the ability to construct dwellings as recreation areas.	Seeks a decision from council that allows this under Rule 15A.10.3
25	25	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports Rule 12.10.3 but notes that 'structure' may be omitted from the rule itself.	Retain Rule 12.10.3 with the addition of 'and structures' in the rule as set out in the submission.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	58	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The permitted activity performance standards in Rule 12.10.3 are onerous. The word 'structure' is missing from the rule. If it is to be included, provide a definition in the Plan.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	59	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	It is unlikely that all structures will be located in the same approved building envelope. Include the word 'activity' in the activity status column of Rule 12.10.3.	Delete performance standard (d) and exclude private property from OLAs in Rule 12.10.3.
283	60	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Performance standard (e) of Rule 12.10.3 is flawed.	Clarify why these performance standards are included. Delete performance standard (e) and exclude private property from OLAs in Rule 12.10.3.
283	61	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The purpose of performance standards (f) and (g) are not clear in Rule 12.10.3. Performance standards (f) and (g) are in conflict with performance standard (e).	Clarify why these performance standards are included. Delete performance standards (f) and (g) and exclude private property from OLAs in Rule 12.10.3.
283	62	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The requirement for and intent of performance standard (h) is not clear in Rule 12.10.3.	Clarify why these performance standards are included
283	63	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Clarify why business buildings require consent if they meet all other bulk and location provisions.	Delete performance standard (i) and exclude private property from OLAs in Rule 12.10.3.
283	81	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The permitted activity performance standards in Rule 13.10.3 are onerous. Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
283	82	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	In relation to Rule 13.10.3 it is unlikely that all structures will be located in the same approved building envelope.	Delete performance standard (d) and exclude private property from OLAs in Rule 13.10.3.
283	83	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Performance standard (e) of Rule 13.10.3 is flawed.	Clarify why these performance standards are included. Delete performance standard (e) and exclude private property from OLAs.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	84	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The purpose of performance standards (f) and (g) of Rule 13.10.3 are not clear. Performance standards (f) and (g) are in conflict with performance standard (e).	Clarify why these performance standards are included. Delete performance standards (f) and (g) and exclude private property from OLAs.
283	85	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The requirement for and intent of performance standard (h) of Rule 13.10.3 is not clear.	Clarify why these performance standards are included
283	86	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Clarify why a business building requires consent under Rule 13.10.3 if it meets all other bulk and location provisions.	Delete performance standard (i) and exclude private property from OLAs.
283	105	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Amended Rule 15A.10.3 removes provision for Papakainga housing and will restrict reasonable use of cultural land.	Clarify / amend the Plan accordingly
359	3	Sharp, Richard	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Rule 12.10.3 regarding buildings, dwellings and structures is too small.	Amend rule to allow for buildings up to 200m ² , and reconsider provisions on visibility and separation distance from the road and Wairoa River.
371	12	Preston, Alan	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Oppose limits in Rule 12.10.3(a). Height restriction of 8m will not adequately protect OLAs.	Limit height restriction in 12.10.2 to not more than 5m.
589[371]	30	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Opposes submission 371/12.	Reject submission 371/12.
378	52	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports new rule 12.10.3.	No decision sought.
378	53	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Opposes in part rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 in that amendments are requested to c) and h) for clarity, and an additional standard j) is requested to locate buildings and structures away from and below ridgelines.	Amend rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 as proposed within the submission including ridgeline control.
378	54	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 so that the activity is non complying if it does not meet the performance standards.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
395	9	Calveley, C	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 too onerous as a permitted activity control.	Delete variation in entirety and/or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation. Or amend Rule 12.10.3; increase gross floor area to 100m2, remove reference in (d) to an approved building envelope, use building consent requirements for geotechnical assessments, delete provision in (h) and the rule to only apply to dwellings.
589[395]	40	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	9	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 too onerous as a permitted activity control.	Delete variation in entirety and/or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation. Or amend Rule 12.10.3; increase gross floor area to 100m2, remove reference in (d) to an approved building envelope, use building consent requirements for geotechnical assessments, delete provision in (h) and the rule to only apply to dwellings.
589[396]	54	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	63	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports new rule 12.10.3.	No decision sought.
397	64	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Opposes in part Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 in that amendments are requested to c) and h) for clarity, and an additional standard j) is requested to locate buildings and structures away from and below ridgelines.	Amend Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 as proposed within the submission including ridgeline control.
397	65	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 so that the activity is non complying if it does not meet the performance standards.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
407	12	Nickolson, Dave	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The performance standards of Rule 12.10.3 are wide ranging and it would be difficult to comply with all nine standards.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
407	13	Nickolson, Dave	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 incorrectly references 500m2 instead of 500m.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to reference 500m instead of 500m2.
407	14	Nickolson, Dave	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The inclusion of 'structure' in Rule 12.10.3 is concerning as this would require resource consent for structures (e.g. a water tank) within the OLA.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow for reasonable use of the land to occur.
442	2	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions in "visual amenity" areas.	The submitter seeks that strict conditions should be applied to any development including: structures to be limited to single storey, reflecting driveways built form.
599[442]	3	Stuart, Helen	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 442/2.	Allow submission 442/2.
450	12	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The performance standards of Rule 12.10.3 are wide ranging and it would be difficult to comply with all nine standards.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
450	13	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 incorrectly references 500m2 instead of 500m.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to reference 500m instead of 500m2.
450	14	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The inclusion of 'structure' in Rule 12.10.3 is concerning as this would require resource consent for structures (e.g. a water tank) within the OLA.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow for reasonable use of the land to occur.
451	52	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports new rule 12.10.3.	No decision sought.
451	53	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Opposes in part rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 in that amendments are requested to c) and h) for clarity, and an additional standard j) is requested to locate buildings and structures away from and below ridgelines.	Amend rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 as proposed within the submission, including ridgeline control.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	54	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend Rules 12.10.3 and 13.10.3 so that the activity is non complying if it does not meet the performance standards.
589[453]	81	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 453/15.	Accept submission 453/15.
453	18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 12.10.3.	The submitter seeks that either farm land is not identified as an Outstanding Landscape or that the maximum floor area is increased to 500 square metres.
458	3	Anderson, John	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 12.10.3.	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.10.3 be removed
459	2	Bull, John R L	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	50m2 building is insufficient for a home not visible from a public viewing point.	Remove unnecessary rules e.g. provide for normal dwelling house.
463	3	Kaipara District Council :	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	The submitter states that the current Rule 12.10.3 as it is currently worded could lead to confusion as to whether commercial buildings are included.	The submitter seeks that the Rule is reworded to refer to the erection of 'dwellings', 'buildings' and 'structures' or alternatively just 'buildings' and 'structures'. The same amendment will need to occur in Chapters 13 and 15.
589[463]	69	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 463/3.	Accept submission 463/3.
464	25	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Rules 12.10.3, 13.10.3, 15A.10.3 and 15B.10.3 are unclear whether it refers to the entire dwelling or just part of the dwelling is visible. The average 3 bedroom house is over 100m2 and should be considered the norm.	Delete 12.10.3 b, d, and h, 13.10.3 b, d, and h, 15A.10.3 b, d, and h, and 15B.10.3 b, d, and h.
464	31	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Dwellings	In Part	Overlay provisions should suffice for Rules 15B.10.5 and 15B.10.6.	Include OLAs in 15B.10.5(3) and 15B.10.6(3) and delete 15B.10.5(4) and 15B.10.6(4).
589[464]	74	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports submission 464/31.	Accept submission 464/31.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
485	2	Chick, Melanie and Alden	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Provisions in Rule 12.10.3 are overly restrictive; deny Submitter's ability to extend dwelling beyond 50m ² necessary for an expanding family, rendering their house unliveable.	That pre-existing homes have liberty to build on land in same manner as anyone else in KDC (those not in landscape areas).
492	12	Grierson, Monique	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The performance standards of Rule 12.10.3 are wide ranging and it would be difficult to comply with all nine standards.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
492	13	Grierson, Monique	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Rule 12.10.3 incorrectly references 500m ² instead of 500m.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to reference 500m instead of 500m ² .
492	14	Grierson, Monique	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	The inclusion of 'structure' in Rule 12.10.3 is concerning as this would require resource consent for structures (e.g. a water tank) within the OLA.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow for reasonable use of the land to occur.
493	3	Alispahic, Natalie	Rules	Dwellings	Oppose	Due to the proximity of the OLA19: Sentinal Rock Coast on our property (Lot 2 DP 333700) any structure or dwelling would generate a need for resource consent. The term 'structure' would require consent even for a water tank.	Amend Rule 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of land. Amend the objectives and policies accordingly.
494	10	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Rules	Dwellings	Support	Supports rule 12.10.3.	No decision sought.
498	12	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Rules	Dwellings	N/A	The limit on building size, where the building is not visible from a public places is overly restrictive.	Amend all permitted activity rules relating to dwellings / structures to allow a more practical gross floor area where the building is not visible from a public place within 500m of the proposed building site.
498	13	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Rules	Dwellings	N/A	Clause 12.10.3(d) requires dwellings to have been subject of a resource consent to comply as a permitted activity. The purpose of the building is irrelevant if other effects are controlled.	Amend the end of Rule 12.10.3(d) so it finishes with 'or' rather than 'and' Delete the reference to commercial and industrial buildings in 12.10.3(i)
119	1	Paine, Robin George Porter	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Management of noxious weeds at Tern Point.	Provision of a rule to allow for the removal of Acacia Trees and other noxious weeds from Tern Point.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
156	1	Leabourn, Maxwell Charles	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes Rule 13.10.1(g) because of the requirement of earthworks and fill to be less than 200m ³ .	Remove the rule.
16	3	Neil, Robyn Patricia	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes Rule 13.10.2 in relation to 51 Marine Parade. Notes that 'indigenous vegetation' is not defined.	Remove the OLA from 51 Marine Parade. If not then define 'indigenous vegetation' to define the vegetation type that was present at the time that baches were built on the section.
190	2	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	There are already enough regulations.	No decision sought.
20	1	Hensman, Peter	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The bush on their property has regenerated. Some land is used for grazing. The submitter's property has been regenerated through clearing weeds and contaminants, pest control and general cleaning of rubbish.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledge submitters efforts to assist their site back to a natural state - Note the submitter does not intend to clear vegetation or undertake earthworks
245	2	Legarth, Larson	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Earthworks and vegetation clearance are inherent in farming practice and keeps NZ from regenerating into scrub, bush and swamp land.	Not stated.
25	24	TrustPower Ltd : Schofield, Robert :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Supports Rule 12.10.1.	Retain Rule 12.10.1 as drafted.
258	15	John K Nielsen, Darwin S Linthicum	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The submitter opposes the performance standard which includes the text 'that will be visible from a viewing point on a public road, public reserve, coastal marine area and the foreshore' contained in Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.3, 13.10.1, 13.10.3, 15A.10.3, 15B.10.1, 15B.10.3	To remove the text: 'that will be visible from a viewing point on a public road, public reserve, coastal marine area and the foreshore' from the rules 12.10.1, 12.10.3, 13.10.1, 13.10.3, 15A.10.3, 15B.10.1, 15B.10.3.
283	57	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The permitted volume in Rule 12.10.1 restricts the reasonable use of a property.	Increase permitted volume amount and exclude private property from OLAs.
283	80	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Under Rule 13.10.1, the permitted threshold in OLAs is greater than the permitted threshold in the Residential Zone.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made and justification of earthworks volumes. Delete assessment criteria (ix).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	104	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The permitted volume level restricts reasonable use of a property in Rule 15A.10.1.	Increase the permitted volume amount and exclude private property from OLAs.
371	11	Preston, Alan	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Oppose amended wording of 12.10.2(4): clearance of indigenous vegetation should only be a Permitted Activity in (i) to (ix), limits listed in (a) are not restrictive enough to protect OLAs.	Amend Permitted Activity status of vegetation removal in 12.10.2(4), and restrict list to (i)-(ix).
589[371]	31	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes submission 371/11.	Reject submission 371/11.
373	15	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Earthworks can have significant adverse effects. Strict control is necessary to achieve the environmental outcomes of OLAs and to give effect to the NZCPS. The provisions should not be less stringent than in the Overlays.	For Rules 12.10.1(4), 15A.10.1(4) and 15B.10.1(4) Include a performance standard for a setback to a bank of any water body in the OLA earthworks rules that is consistent with any relevant overlay rule. Reduce the permitted activity OLA excavation and fill volume to 150m ³ .
606[373]	1	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes submission 375/15.	That submission 375/15 be disallowed.
373	16	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The vegetation clearance rules do not give effect to the NZCPS or Regional Policy Statement. The Districts OLA outcomes will not be achieved because of lack of protection. Permitting clearance of 500m for a house site may result in significant adverse fire hazard effects. Provision of an exemption for walking tracks is supported however 1.2m is insufficient for some tourist and visitor tracks. There is no justification for including less rigorous standards than in an overlay.	Amend Rules 12.10.2(4), 13.10.2(4), 15A.10.2(4) and 15B.10.2(4) as follows: a) delete the term "and is not located within 100m of the coastal marine area" from clause (a). b) Add a clause for areas of OLAs also containing an overlay. "It is not part of a continuous area of predominantly indigenous vegetation over 1 hectare in area." c) Add a clause "It is not within an indigenous wetland". d) delete clause II) e) amend clause iv) so it provides for a width of walking track up to 1.5m.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
606[373]	2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes submission 373/16.	That submission 373/16 be disallowed.
373	20	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter partly opposes Rule 13.10.1(3).	The submitter seeks that Rule 13.10.1(3) is amended to read: '(a) Alter the permitted activity volume in b0 to 100m3 (b) Insert a setback to water bodies of 20 metres. (c) Insert the following further performance standards: The site is not within any area known to be subject to instability or flood hazard; Any excavation or fill on land does not have an average slope greater than 1 in 8, and extend over an area greater than 200m2'
606[373]	3	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Oppose submission 373/20.	Submission 373/20 be disallowed.
373	21	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter opposes Rules 12.13.4, 15B.12.2 applying in the Outstanding Landscape Areas.	The submitter seeks that Rules 12.13.4 and 15B.12.2 do not apply in the Outstanding Landscape Areas.
378	48	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) need amendment for conciseness, clarity, and consistency with the s32 report.	Amend Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) as proposed within the submission to 1. reducing volume (to 150cu.m.), 2. proximity to water bodies and 3. deleting reference to view points.
378	49	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.1(4), 12.10.2(4), 13.10.1(3) and 13.10.2(4) the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend activity status to be non-complying for all rules.
378	50	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Support addition of performance standards 12.10.2 (1)c, (2)c and (3) c as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	51	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) needs amendment and addition to the performance standards to be consistent with Rule 13.10.2 b) for indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area within an OLA.	Amend rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) performance standards and add an additional performance standard b) as proposed within the submission.
397	58	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Oppose in part amendments to Rule 12.10.1 as the word 'provided' in (1)e, (2)c and (3)c is unnecessary.	Delete the word 'provided' in 12.10.1 (1)e, (2)c and (3)c.
397	59	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) need amendment for conciseness, clarity, and consistency with the s32 report.	Amend Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) as proposed within the submission to 1. Reduce volume to 150cu.m; 2. Proximity to water; 3 Delete reference to viewpoint.
397	60	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.1(4), 12.10.2(4), 13.10.1(3) and 13.10.2(4) the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend activity status to be non-complying for all rules.
397	61	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Support addition of performance standards 12.10.2 (1)c, (2)c and (3) c as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
397	62	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) needs amendment and addition to the performance standards to be consistent with Rule 13.10.2 b) for indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area within an OLA.	Amend rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) performance standards and add an additional performance standard b) as proposed within the submission.
407	11	Nickolson, Dave	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The maximum volume of 300m3 for earthworks (under Rule 12.10.1) is a low threshold.	The permitted activity threshold should be increased unless justification is provided as to why 300m3 is appropriate.
4	2	Biddles, Christopher	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes OLA restrictions particularly for Rule 12.10.1 (Excavation and Fill)	Remove Rule 12.10.1
4	4	Biddles, Christopher	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes OLA restriction particularly on Rule 12.10.2 Vegetation Clearance as too restrictive.	Remove OLA from private property.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
444	11	Elliott, Jan	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 12.10.2(4).	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.10.2(4) is amended to not allow the removal of vegetation as a permitted activity but only to allow it in the exceptional circumstances listed in (i) to (ix).
450	11	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The maximum volume of 300m ³ for earthworks (under Rule 12.10.1) is a low threshold.	The permitted activity threshold should be increased unless justification is provided as to why 300m ³ is appropriate.
451	48	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) need amendment for conciseness, clarity, and consistency with the s32 report.	Amend Rules 12.10.1(4) and 13.10.1(3) as proposed within the submission to 1. Reduce volume (to 150cu.m.); 2. Proximity to water; 3. Delete reference to viewpoint.
451	49	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	If the permitted activity performance standards are not met for Rules 12.10.1(4), 12.10.2(4), 13.10.1(3) and 13.10.2(4) the activity should be non complying to reflect s6(b) of the Act.	Amend activity status to be non-complying for all rules.
451	50	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Support addition of performance standards 12.10.2 (1)c, (2)c and (3) c as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
451	51	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) needs amendment and addition to the performance standards to be consistent with Rule 13.10.2 b) for indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area within an OLA.	Amend rules 12.10.2(4) and 13.10.2(4) performance standards and add an additional performance standard b) as proposed within the submission.
452	10	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	N/A	The Rules relating to vegetation clearance are confusing and need to be amended.	Amendments to the wording of the Rules relating to vegetation clearance to require consent for any indigenous vegetation over 3m in height. Wording provided by submitter.
606[452]	13	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Oppose submission 452/10.	Submission 452/10 be disallowed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
453	16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 12.10.1(4) Excavation and Fill in Outstanding Landscape Areas.	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.10.1(4) is amended so that either earthworks associated with primary production are excluded or that farm land is not identified as an OLA; and is amended to read as found in their submission.
453	17	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 12.10.2(4).	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.10.2(4) is deleted.
464	24	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 13.10.1 and 13.10.2 are not consistent with the overlay areas and overlay provisions of Waterways and Kai Iwi Lakes overlays should be defaulted to, where relevant.	Remove references to additional OLA provisions with the default position that OLAs will be equal to Kai Iwi Lakes and Waterways overlays.
589[464]	75	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Supports submission 464/24.	Accept submission 464/24.
464	30	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The overlay provisions of Rules 13.10.1, 15A.10.1, 15A.10.2 should suffice.	Include OLAs in 13.10.1(2), 15A.10.1(3) and 15A.10.2(3) and delete 13.10.1(3), 15A.10.1(4) and 15A.10.2(4).
589[464]	73	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Supports submission 464/30.	Accept submission 464/30.
466	2	Rountree, Kelvin Bruce	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter is opposed in part to Rule 16.8.2.11.	The submitter seeks that Rule 16.8.2.11 be amended to reflect the fact that earthworks or excavation and fill can be cumulative over time, e.g. 2000m3 per annum if for a justifiable reason.
480	2	Bracey, Mark Stanley	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Rule 12.10.2 providing 500m2 maximum allowance for vegetation clearance is inadequate for pasture/grass control. Restricts ability to maintain pasture quality and profitability of farmland.	Consent should not be needed for normal farming practice.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
484	35	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes wording in Chapter 12 (Rural). Destruction or clearance of indigenous vegetation should not be a permitted activity except in the circumstances listed in (i)-(ix).	Amend wording to not allow the removal of vegetation as a permitted activity except in circumstances listed in (i)-(ix).
484	36	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Opposes wording in Chapter 12 (Rural). Parameters listed, particularly in relation to vegetation not greater than 3m and 500m2, are not restrictive enough to protect OLAs.	
490	1	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry : Boyd, Brian :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Consultation with the Department of Conservation (and the Ministry of Maori Development) is required if the land is subject to vegetation clearance rules within a VAL or other overlay.	Take measures to protect the forest, in particular the regenerating forest, from pest, stock, fire, and other threats.
492	11	Grierson, Monique	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The maximum volume of 300m3 for earthworks (under Rule 12.10.1) is a low threshold.	The permitted activity threshold should be increased unless justification is provided as to why 300m3 is appropriate.
493	2	Alispahic, Natalie	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	The maximum volume of earthworks (300m3) per 12 month period is a relatively low threshold.	Amend Rule 12.10.1 and 12.10.2 to allow reasonable use of the land by increasing the permitted activity threshold unless justification can be provided as to why 300m3 is appropriate.
494	8	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Support	Supports rules 12.10.1(1)(e), 12.10.1(2)(c), 12.10.1(4), 12.10.2(1)(c), 12.10.2(2)(c) and 12.10.2(4).	No decision sought.
494	9	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	Opposes rule 12.10.2(4) in part as this rule does not provide enough protection.	Amend rule 12.10.2(4) to provide for greater protection for vegetation in coastal areas.
500	7	Legarth, Olivia	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Rules 12.10.1 restrict excavation and fill for maintaining farm access tracks, farm drains, farm crossings and other works.	Amend 12.10.1 where it relates to farmland, regardless of whether that farmland is classified as an OLA or VAL.
500	8	Legarth, Olivia	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Rule 12.10.2 restricts farmers' use of productive capacity of land regarding vegetation clearance, creating farm access tracks and other works.	Amend 12.10.2 where it relates to farmland, regardless of whether that farmland is classified as an OLA or VAL.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
513	1	The Welch Investment Trust : Davies, Evan :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	Oppose	Rule requires a resource consent for any excavation or fill on a site within an OLA, whether the Landscape Area is affected or not. Inconsistent with other provisions in the Variation e.g. dwelling construction.	Amend 12.10.1 (at 12.10.1(1)(e), 2(c), 3(c) and 4(a)) to refer to 'areas of excavation or fill' being located within an Outstanding Natural Landscape rather than 'sites'. Implement any other measures that give effect to the submission and any consequential amendments required.
7	2	Hancock Forest Management NZ : Buckingham, Ursula :	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter is opposed to requiring a resource consent under Rules 12.10.1 and 12.10.2 because they are onerous.	The submitter seeks all production forestry be excluded from the OLA's.
81	1	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	Excavation and Vegetation Clearance	In Part	The submitter partially supports Rule 12.10.2.	The submitter seeks that a paragraph be included that states: 'The vegetation clearance of plantation forestry is excluded from restrictions applied to VALs'
149	4	Bull, P	Rules	General	Oppose	The Rules are highly obstructive and restrictive in other Chapters of the Plan.	No decision stated.
199	3	Wrightson, Michael	Rules	General	In Part	Assessment criteria is too generalised, offering the public no guidance as to what is acceptable.	Amend and simplify the assessment criteria.
203	1	Smith, Merilyn	Rules	General	Oppose	Opposes rules of Chapter 18 as restricts the use of submitters land, which is cleared farm.	Delete the Variation in its entirety. Council should concentrate on other matters e.g. improving road network.
255	2	Hogan, Jonathon Peter	Rules	General	Oppose	OLA's and VAL's do not have surveyed accurate legal boundaries and are not recognised on Land Titles. Specific Provisions: 12.10.1 - 12.10.4, 12.10.6, 12.10.7, 12.10.25, 12.10.27, 12.12.1, 12.13.1.	Survey OLA's and VAL's and include on Land Titles.
283	106	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	General	Oppose	Oppose rules 15A10.18, 15A.10.19, 15A.10.20, 15A10.21, 15A10.22.	Same relief sought as per comments on comparative Rural and Residential rules.
283	107	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	General	Oppose	Oppose rules 15B10.3, 15B.10.5, 15B.10.19, 15B.10.20, 15B.10.21, 15B.10.22, 15B.10.23, 15B.10.24, 15B.11.3, 15B.15.3, 15B.15.4, 15B.15.5, 15B15.6, 15B.15.7, 15B.15.8, 15B.15.9 and 15B.15.10.	Same relief sought as per comments on comparative Rural and Residential rules.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	47	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to the assessment criteria in Chapter 11 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to the significance of OLAs.	No decision sought.
378	55	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.10.3, 12.10.4, 12.10.5 and 12.10.11 as providing appropriate recognition and protection to OLAs.	No decision sought.
382	2	McCahon, Allister D and A Maree	Rules	General	In Part	Plantation forestry should not encroach on views through outstanding landscapes to the sea. Also an issue of seed dispersal in high wind zones exist.	Insert rule in 12.10 - plantation forestry in an Outstanding Landscape to be a consented activity. Trees to be managed to not encroach on the view through the landscape to the sea.
382	3	McCahon, Allister D and A Maree	Rules	General	In Part	Prohibit encroachment on view through an Outstanding Landscape to the sea by utilities and structures, giving effect to the NCPS.	Insert an additional clause rendering the construction of utilities and structures which encroach on sea views through Outstanding Landscapes a prohibited activity.
397	48	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	General	Support	Supports Chapter 0.1.2 amendments as necessary and appropriate.	No decision sought.
397	57	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to the assessment criteria in Chapter 11 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to the significance of OLAs.	No decision sought.
397	66	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.10.3, 12.10.4, 12.10.5 and 12.10.11 as providing appropriate recognition and protection to OLAs.	No decision sought.
407	10	Nickolson, Dave	Rules	General	Oppose	The new rules (especially Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3) have the potential to restrict certain activities on the submitter's land.	Amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
429	1	Malofy, Gary	Rules	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the assessment criteria for the Omaru Valley Bush detailed on Map 2 Appendix G for the submitters two lots on Porters Road, Ararua	The submitter seeks that their two properties be removed from the assessment criteria for the Omaru Valley Bush.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
442	7	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	General	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions.	The submitter seeks that the definition of OLA's should be determined by the natural features and not to be compromised by consents that have already been issued.
599[442]	8	Stuart, Helen	Rules	General	Support	Supports submission 442/7.	Allow submission 442/7.
450	10	Alispahic, Gabrielle and Sam	Rules	General	Oppose	The new rules (especially Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3) have the potential to restrict certain activities on the submitter's land.	Amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
451	47	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to the assessment criteria in Chapter 11 as necessary and giving appropriate recognition to the significance of OLAs.	No decision sought.
451	55	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	General	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.10.3, 12.10.4, 12.10.5 and 12.10.11 as providing appropriate recognition and protection to OLAs.	No decision sought.
453	15	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	General	In Part	The submitter opposes in part the Activity Status: 'Activities within and Outstanding Landscape Area will be assessed as a Discretionary Activity'.	The submitter seeks that the Activity Status: 'Activities within and Outstanding Landscape Area will be assessed as a Discretionary Activity' is reworded as: 'Activities within and Outstanding Landscape Area will be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity'.
455	1	Douglas Hilton Family Trust : Wood, Wynyard :	Rules	General	In Part	Ensure provisions of Variation are consistent with and not incompatible with good dairy farming practice.	Participation in submission and hearing process to ensure land development potential and efficient operation of a dairy farm is not unreasonably affected.
455	2	Douglas Hilton Family Trust : Wood, Wynyard :	Rules	General	In Part	Provisions should not unreasonably inhibit or restrain future development of the property for farming, residential use or changing land use.	Participation in submission and hearing process to ensure land development potential and efficient operation of a dairy farm is not unreasonably affected.
458	11	Anderson, John	Rules	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the number and complexity of rules in the proposed plan.	The submitter seeks that proposed plan is simple and easily understood by those who have to abide by it.
458	14	Anderson, John	Rules	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to farming not being a permitted activity.	The submitter seeks that farming be a permitted activity.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
475	2	Campbell, Len	Rules	General	Oppose	Lack of certainty in Chapter 12 relating to use of land.	Delete assessment criteria - as referred to in submission, to remove reference to VALs and subjectivity of criteria.
484	40	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	General	In Part	Rules should be inserted OLA's.	The insertion of Rules for OLA.
486	25	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Rules	General	N/A	Variation 1 proposes to include the following assessment criterion in a range of rules in Chapters 10, 11, 12, 13, 15A and 15B of the PDP: 'Effects on the landscape and heritage values of an [OLA] identified in Map Series 1 or [VAL] identified in Appendix G and the extent to which the subdivision, use or development meets the objectives, policies and outcomes of Chapter 18 - Landscapes, and the additional assessment criteria contained in Appendix c'. This criterion has been included as a matter for assessment in the Rules managing a wide range of activities in these chapters, including activities occurring within an OLA and activities not within an OLA. It is considered that different assessment criteria should be developed for activities occurring within an OLA compared to those not within an OLA.	Different assessment criteria should be developed for activities occurring within and OLA and activities not located within an OLA in the assessment criterion in Chapters 10, 11, 12, 13, 15A and 15B. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
486	26	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Rules	General	N/A	Variation 1 proposes to include the following assessment criterion in a range of rules in Chapters 10, 11, 12, 13, 15A and 15B of the PDP: 'Effects on the landscape and heritage values of an [OLA] identified in Map Series 1 or [VAL] identified in Appendix G and the extent to which the subdivision, use or development meets the objectives, policies and outcomes of Chapter 18 - Landscapes, and the additional assessment criteria contained in Appendix C'. This criterion has been included as a matter for assessment in the Rules managing a wide range of activities in these chapters, including activities occurring within an OLA and activities not within an OLA. It is considered inappropriate to make reference to the 'heritage values' of any OLA as the focus should be on landscape not heritage value.	The deletion of the reference to 'heritage values of any Outstanding Landscape Area' from the assessment criterion in Chapters 10, 11, 12, 13, 15A and 15B relating to the effects on landscape values. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
492	10	Grierson, Monique	Rules	General	Oppose	The new rules (especially Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3) have the potential to restrict certain activities on the submitter's land.	Amend Rules 12.10.1, 12.10.2, 12.10.3 to allow reasonable use of the land to occur.
495	2	Dassler, Neville James	Rules	General	Support	Support the pest control programme presently in place at the Maungaraho Rock Reserve per Rule 18.8.2.	Implement a pest control programme similar to that which is in place with the Maungaraho Pest Control Group for the whole area.
498	4	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Rules	General	N/A	Outstanding Natural Features are not addressed in Variation 1 but are sensitive to land disturbance activities.	Include Rules to protect outstanding natural features, focusing on earthworks and land disturbance activities.
602[498]	29	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Rules	General	N/A	Opposes submission 498/4	Disallow submission 498/4
606[498]	14	Federated Farmers of New Zealand : Dasent, Rhea :	Rules	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 498/4.	Submission 498/4 be disallowed.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
498	11	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Rules	General	N/A	Effects on landscapes should only be considered where effects are likely and/or it is related to the purpose of the rule. The rules go beyond the scope set in the objectives and policies of Chapter 18.	Remove landscapes as a matter of discretion where the rules manage other effects such as reverse sensitivity, nuisance or hazardous substances.
602[498]	30	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Rules	General	Support	Supports submission 498/11	Allow submission 498/11
499	11	Northpower Ltd : Brownie, Sarah :	Rules	General	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 10.11.3 Network Utilities and Alterations to Network Utilities within an Outstanding Landscape area.	The submitter seeks that Restricted Discretionary status applies to the effects attributable to installation or alteration of networks.
602[499]	28	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Rules	General	In Part	Supports submission 499/11	Allow submission 499/11
598[499]	11	Stuart, Helen	Rules	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/11.	Disallow submission 499/11.
560[499]	11	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	General	Oppose	Opposes submission 499/11.	Disallow submission 499/11.
500	6	Legarth, Olivia	Rules	General	Oppose	Restrictions will force onerous consent requirements onto landowners for activities fundamental to farming e.g. vegetation clearance, excavation and erecting and altering a structure.	Exclude all farmland from OLAs and VALs.
512	3	The Bream Tail Residents Association : Davies, Evan :	Rules	General	Oppose	Variation requires replication of consents already granted for subdivision development despite Rule 12.10.3, contrary to the RMA.	Exempt Bream Tail subdivision from requiring further consents. Any other measures that give effect to the submission and/or consequential amendments required.
518	13	Thomas Coates Estate Trustees : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	General	Oppose	The submitter cites excavation, vegetation clearance, bulk and location, traffic, access and parking rules as necessitating the need for resource consent for future activities on Baldrock Estate. Variation 1's provisions are considered to be stricter than those in the Operative Kaipara District Plan, making it unlikely for quarrying activities to be granted resource consent. The inclusion of such rules is not supported.	The inclusion of such rules is not supported.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
523	1	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Rules	General	In Part	OLAs and VALs not be cleared or excavated. Landowners relieved of rates for that area.	Accept Option 3 page 57 (Appendix E) "No subdivision".
523	2	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Rules	General	In Part	Concern about 12.10.20 and 12.10.21. OLAs and VALs should be exempt from hazardous substances, radioactive material and effluent storage.	Render hazardous substances, radioactive material and effluent storage unpermitted activities.
525	4	Bowring, Ian and Glenda	Rules	General	Oppose	Assessment criteria is too subjective. Fails to provide certainty to applicants for resource consents as to reasonable use.	Delete or amend from Chapter 12 Rules "effects of landscape and heritage of any outstanding area identified in Map Series 1 or Appendix G". Delete VALs.
58	1	Collings, Andrea	Rules	General	Oppose	Opposes rules of Chapter 18 as restricts the use of the submitters land.	'Scrap the idea'. Council should concentrate on other matters (roads).
70	4	Smith, Edward John	Rules	General	N/A	The submitter wishes to establish a small quarry on their property	The submitter seeks some specific permitted, controlled and discretionary activities for mining and mineral exploration [refer to submission for activities].
81	2	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	General	In Part	The submitter partially supports Rule 12.10.2, with suggested amendments	The submitter seeks that Plantation Forestry be excluded from VAL's, or if it is included, only in conjunction with consultation and/or compensation
145	2	Groupsky, Patrick	Rules	None	Oppose	The submitter opposes the OLA Rules because they are not sufficiently differentiated from other rules in the plan.	The submitter requests that Any privately owned section that falls wholly or partially within an OLA is not restricted by OLA rules, only the original rules in the district plan.
244	4	Maude, Cynthia Joy	Rules	None	In Part	Environmental protection can be achieved with current rules, if enforced.	Not stated.
283	54	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	None	Oppose	Locating utility services underground has the potential to generate adverse effects. The submission questions the grammar of 10.11.3(a).	Review and amend Rule 10.11.3.
283	55	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	None	Oppose	Unclear why this matter for assessment is necessary when considering applications for works on an existing road under Rule 11.10.1.	Delete Matters for Assessment (viii)

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	56	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	None	Oppose	Unclear why this matter for assessment is necessary when considering applications for any other works on a road under Rule 11.10.2.	Delete Matters for Assessment (viii)
589[395]	42	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	None	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
542	4	Jones, Charlotte	Rules	None	Oppose	Visual amenity is not a landscape assessment under the RMA and is unnecessary.	Delete "Rules 18.5.2, 18.5.3 and 18.5.4".
442	6	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	Reverse Sensitivity	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions	The submitter seeks appropriate landscaping to be included in all conditions
599[442]	7	Stuart, Helen	Rules	Reverse Sensitivity	Support	Supports submission 442/6.	Allow submission 442/6.
378	67	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Correct Note 1 of Rule 12.13.2 regarding affected parties.	Correct Note 1 regarding affected parties.
397	78	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Correct Note 1 of Rule 12.13.2 regarding affected parties.	Correct Note 1 regarding affected parties.
451	67	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Spelling/typographical errors/Clause 16 amendments	In Part	Correct Note 1 of Rule 12.13.2 regarding affected parties.	Correct Note 1 regarding affected parties.
254	6	Greville, John Willis	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to all subdivision of land in the rural environment being a discretionary activity under Variation 1.	The submitter seeks that subdivision rules relating to the OLA's from Variation 1 are reverted back to the subdivision rules that apply to the west coast area.
283	70	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	It is unclear why the Department of Conservation is deemed an affected party under Rule 12.13.2.	Clarify why DoC is an affected party and delete Note 1 from the Plan.
283	71	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 12.16.1 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	88	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 13.10.20 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	89	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (x) of Rule 12.10.21 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (x).
283	93	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	It is unclear why rule 13.11.2 has been amended to exclude OLAs. There is no rule which provides for boundary adjustments with an OLA.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii). Retain existing rule and delete reference to OLAs.
283	94	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Assumed the 20ha minimum lot size in Rule 13.13.1 is a mistake as there is no discussion in the Section 32 analysis.	Clarify in the Planners s42A report the minimum allotment size and amend accordingly.
371	13	Preston, Alan	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Subdivision should not be permitted as a Discretionary Activity in an OLA unless for the purpose of transfer to the QEII Trust.	Amend wording of Rule 12.15.1. Only permit subdivision in an OLA for transfer to the QEII Trust.
589[371]	29	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Opposes submission 371/13.	Reject submission 371/13.
373	18	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	The submitter supports in part Rules 12.13.1, 12.13.2, 15A.12.1, 15A.12.2, 15B.12.1, 15B.12.2.	The submitter seeks that the Environmental Benefit Rule is amended by: '(a) Providing for one environmental benefit lot as a restricted discretionary activity, and more than one environmental benefit lot as a discretionary activity; and (b) replacing clause c) with "All of the habitat or landscape feature on the site shall be protected.'
373	19	Department of Conservation, Director General of Conservation	Rules	Subdivision	N/A	The submitter supports in part Rules 12.13.1, 12.13.2, 15A.12.1, 15A.12.2, 15B.12.1, 15B.12.2, 12.3.3, 12.3.4.	The submitter seeks that the following provision is inserted in Rules 12.13.1, 12.13.2, 15A.12.1, 15A.12.2, 15B.12.1, 15B.12.2, 12.3.3, 12.3.4: 'Any subdivision proposal that does not comply with the standards in this rule is a non-complying activity.'
378	58	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports inclusion of Figure 12.3c.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	59	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.12.1, 12.12.2 and 12.12.3.	No decision sought.
378	60	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part Rule 12.13.1 - Environmental Benefit to the extent that the terms of subdivision are confusing and should be rewritten.	Rule 12.13.1 should relate only to a 'Landscape Environmental Benefit' applicable to those sites identified as OLAs and VALs. The size of the ecological environmental benefit should be reviewed based on the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria.
378	61	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Amendments to matters for discretion for Rule 12.13.1 are generally supported.	No decision sought.
378	62	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Exclusion of OLAs from rule 12.13.2 is supported.	No decision sought.
378	63	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Restricted discretionary status of Rule 12.13.2 is opposed.	Activity status should be discretionary.
378	64	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose the level of environmental benefits proposed in the Rural zone including the overlays. The number of environmental benefit lots enabled will undermine the purpose of the basic densities proposed for rural and overlays.	No decision sought
378	65	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports Rule 12.13.2(h).	Clarification is needed about the application of the rule to 'each specified portion of the site'.
378	66	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose size of environmental benefits for Rule 12.13.2.	Minimum environmental benefits should be reviewed based on criteria such as the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria, and a minimum parent lot size should be set.
378	68	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Support the amendments made to the terms for subdivision and matters for discretion of Rule 12.13.2, 12.13.3 and 12.14.1.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	69	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports discretionary status and 20ha minimum site area of new rules 12.15.1 (1).	No decision sought.
378	70	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part new rules 12.15.1 (2) and 13.13.1 as the application of this rule and its consequences are not clear.	Insert two simple diagrams illustrating the intentions of (2) a) and b).
385	2	Beskeen, Andrew	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Assessment of extent to which subdivision use or development meets the objectives, policies and outcomes of Chapter 18 is overly subjective.	Delete assessment criteria for subdivision rules, and/or subjectivity in the criteria.
395	10	Calveley, C	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Rule 12.12.1(xvii) imposes financial burden on landowner proceeding with a development application with onerous landscape analyses. Should only affect OLAs.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend Rule 12.12.1(xvii) to apply only to OLAs, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	41	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
395	11	Calveley, C	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Requirement to protect an entire feature in Rule 12.13.1(b) lacks specificity. Rule impossible to enforced.	Delete Variation in entirety, delete Rule 12.13.1(b), or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
395	12	Calveley, C	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Inclusion of an entire feature in Rule 12.13.2 lacks specificity. Overall environmental benefit is of little value as incentive is does not encourage implementation.	Delete Variation in entirety, delete Rule 12.13.2, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	43	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
395	13	Calveley, C	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The subdivision opportunity in Rule 12.15.1 is out of step with the general subdivision provisions.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend Rule 12.15.1 so only new assessment criteria for OLA, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	44	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
396	10	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Rule 12.12.1(xvii) imposes financial burden on landowner proceeding with a development application with onerous landscape analyses. Should only affect OLAs.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend Rule 12.12.1(xvii) to apply only to OLAs, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	55	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
396	11	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Requirement to protect an entire feature in Rule 12.13.1(b) lacks specificity. Rule impossible to enforced.	Delete Variation in entirety, delete Rule 12.13.1(b), or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	56	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
396	12	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Inclusion of an entire feature in Rule 12.13.2 lacks specificity. Overall environmental benefit is of little value as incentive is does not encourage implementation.	Delete Variation in entirety, delete Rule 12.13.2, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	57	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
396	13	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	The subdivision opportunity in Rule 12.15.1 does not correlate with the general subdivision provisions.	Delete Variation in entirety, amend Rule 12.15.1, or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	58	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
397	69	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports inclusion of Figure 12.3c.	No decision sought.
397	70	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.12.1, 12.12.2 and 12.12.3.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
397	71	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part Rule 12.13.1 - Environmental Benefit to the extent that the terms of subdivision are confusing and should be rewritten.	Rule 12.13.1 should relate only to a 'Landscape Environmental Benefit' applicable to those sites identified as OLAs and VALs. The size of the ecological environmental benefit should be reviewed based on the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria.
397	72	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Amendments to matters for discretion for Rule 12.13.1 are generally supported.	No decision sought.
397	73	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Exclusion of OLAs from rule 12.13.2 is supported.	No decision sought.
397	74	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Restricted discretionary status of Rule 12.13.2 is opposed.	Activity status should be discretionary.
397	75	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose the level of environmental benefits proposed in the Rural zone including the overlays. The number of environmental benefit lots enabled will undermine the purpose of the basic densities proposed for rural and overlays.	No decision sought
397	76	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports Rule 12.13.2(h).	Clarification is needed about the application of the rule to 'each specified portion of the site'.
397	77	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose size of environmental benefits for Rule 12.13.2.	Minimum environmental benefits should be reviewed based on criteria such as the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria, and a minimum parent lot size should be set.
397	79	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Support the amendments made to the terms for subdivision and matters for discretion of Rule 12.13.2, 12.13.3 and 12.14.1.	No decision sought.
397	80	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports discretionary status and 20ha minimum site area of new rules 12.15.1 (1).	No decision sought.
397	81	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part new rules 12.15.1 (2) and 13.13.1 as the application of this rule and its consequences are not clear.	Insert two simple diagrams illustrating the intentions of (2) a) and b).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
444	13	Elliott, Jan	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	The submitter opposes in part Rule 12.15.1 - Subdivision in an Outstanding Landscape Area.	The submitter seeks that Rule 12.15.1 is amended so that subdivision is not allowed as a Discretionary Activity.
451	58	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports inclusion of Figure 12.3c.	No decision sought.
451	59	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports amendments to Rules 12.12.1, 12.12.2 and 12.12.3.	No decision sought.
451	60	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part Rule 12.13.1 - Environmental Benefit to the extent that the terms of subdivision are confusing and should be rewritten.	Rule 12.13.1 should relate only to a 'Landscape Environmental Benefit' applicable to those sites identified as OLAs and VALs. The size of the ecological environmental benefit should be reviewed based on the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria.
451	61	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Amendments to matters for discretion for Rule 12.13.1 are generally supported.	No decision sought.
451	62	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Exclusion of OLAs from rule 12.13.2 is supported.	No decision sought.
451	63	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Restricted discretionary status of Rule 12.13.2 is opposed.	Activity status should be discretionary.
451	64	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose the level of environmental benefits proposed in the Rural zone including the overlays. The number of environmental benefit lots enabled will undermine the purpose of the basic densities proposed for rural and overlays.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	65	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports Rule 12.13.2(h).	Clarification is needed about the application of the rule to 'each specified portion of the site'.
451	66	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Oppose size of environmental benefits for Rule 12.13.2.	Minimum environmental benefits should be reviewed based on criteria such as the value of the feature being protected, the need for habitat viability and other criteria, and a minimum parent lot size should be set.
451	68	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Support the amendments made to the terms for subdivision and matters for discretion of Rule 12.13.2, 12.13.3 and 12.14.1.	No decision sought.
451	69	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports discretionary status and 20ha minimum site area of new rules 12.15.1 (1).	No decision sought.
451	70	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	Oppose in part new rules 12.15.1 (2) and 13.13.1 as the application of this rule and its consequences are not clear.	Insert two simple diagrams illustrating the intentions of (2) a) and b).
464	29	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Subdivision	In Part	The matters for discretion discourage protection, maintenance and enhancement of Landscape Areas (for 12.13.1, 12.13.2, 12.13.4, 12.13.3, 12.14.1, 12.15.1).	Modify the matters for discretion.
484	38	Mangawhai Ratepayers and Residents Association : Tschirky, Martina :	Rules	Subdivision	Oppose	Subdivision should not be permitted as a Discretionary Activity in an OLA unless it is for the QEII Trust.	Not to permit subdivision as a Discretionary Activity in an OLA except for transfer to the QEII Trust.
494	11	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports rules 12.12, 12.13 and 12.14 such that they do not apply to subdivision of land covered by an OLA.	No decision sought.
494	12	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Rules	Subdivision	Support	Supports rule 12.15.1.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
515	5	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Rules	Subdivision	N/A	The submitter states that not enough detail has been given as to what constitutes inappropriate subdivision, particularly in the OLA areas.	The submitter seeks further clarification of subdivision threats, both overt and covert.
283	72	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (viii) of Rule 12.16.3 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (viii).
283	73	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (x) of Rule 12.16.3 Water Supply is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (x).
283	74	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiii) of Rule 12.16.5 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii).
283	75	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 12.16.6 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	76	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 12.16.7 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	77	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xii) of Rule 12.16.7 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xii).
283	78	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xii) of Rule 12.16.9 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xii).
283	79	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xiii) of Rule 12.16.9 Esplanade Management for Lots more than 4ha is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii).
283	95	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 13.14.1 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
283	96	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (viii) of Rule 13.14.3 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (viii).
283	97	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (x) of Rule 13.14.4 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (x).
283	98	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xii) of Rule 14.14.5 Stormwater Disposal is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xiii).
283	99	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 13.14.6 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	100	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (vii) of Rule 13.14.7 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (vii).
283	101	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xii) of Rule 13.14.8 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xii).
283	102	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xv) of Rule 13.14.9 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xv).
283	103	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Oppose	The purpose of assessment criteria (xv) of Rule 13.14.10 is not clear. It is not clear how non-compliance would be assessed.	Clarify why the amendment to the assessment criteria has been made. Delete assessment criteria (xv).
378	71	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Support	Support amendments to Rule 12.15 and assessment criteria of Rules 12.15.1 - 12.15.10.	No decision sought.
397	82	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Support	Support amendments to Rule 12.15 and assessment criteria of Rules 12.15.1 - 12.15.10.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
451	71	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Support	Support amendments to Rule 12.15 and assessment criteria of Rules 12.15.1 - 12.15.10.	No decision sought.
81	4	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	Support	The submitter seeks greater restrictions in Rules 10.11.4, 10.11.5, 10.11.6 and 10.11.3	The submitter seeks that more stringent restrictions are placed on utility companies wishing to construct masts in landscape areas.
81	5	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	In Part	The submitter partially supports Rules 10.11.3 - 10.11.6	The submitter seeks that utility companies not be permitted to build their infrastructure through landscape areas, unless they can justify it for reasons other than cost
81	6	Stuart, Ian William	Rules	Subdivision Performance Standards	In Part	The submitter partially supports Rules 10.11.4 - 10.11.7	The submitter seeks that Council add: 'Activities within outstanding landscape areas and visual amenity landscapes will be addressed as a discretionary activity'
156	3	Leabourn, Maxwell Charles	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	N/A	Opposes proposed Rule 13.10.27(h) because they do not want to have to change their existing gate.	Delete Rule 13.10.27(h).
20	3	Hensman, Peter	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	In Part	Access to the site is via a stream needing 4WD access.	Acknowledge the challenges faced in managing a stream that undergoes huge changes in character.
276	9	Robinson, Perrin	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Oppose	Necessity of being able to create fire breaks in vegetation for trucks to access properties. Also to be used by Northpower repair trucks in case of emergency. Property links Cove Road Mangawhai Substation to Langs Beach through access routes.	Not stated.
368	9	Robinson, Asa	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Oppose	Necessity of being able to create fire breaks in vegetation for trucks to access properties. Also to be used by Northpower repair trucks in case of emergency. Property links Cove Road Mangawhai Substation to Langs Beach through access routes.	Not stated.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
378	57	Marunui Conservation Ltd : Hawley, Catherine :	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.24 with further amendment to require discretionary resource consent if the formation of vehicle access and driveways are within an OLA.	Amend Rule so that vehicle access and driveways require consent for a discretionary activity within an OLA.
397	68	Hawley, Catherine and John	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.24 with further amendment to require discretionary resource consent if the formation of vehicle access and driveways are within an OLA.	Amend Rule so that vehicle access and driveways require consent for a discretionary activity within an OLA.
442	5	Forde, Jeanette	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	In Part	The submitter supports OLA's and VAL's and believes there should be more restrictions	The submitter seeks that driveways should not be visually inappropriate
599[442]	6	Stuart, Helen	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Support	Supports submission 442/5.	Allow submission 442/5.
451	57	Friends of the Brynderwyns Society Incorporated : Elliot, Rachel :	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Support	Supports amendments to Rule 12.10.24 with further amendment to require discretionary resource consent if the formation of vehicle access and driveways are within an OLA.	Amend Rule so that vehicle access and driveways require consent for a discretionary activity within an OLA.
464	27	Brian McEwing, Julie Geange	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	In Part	Access to the house is not permitted, but building a house is.	Delete Rule 12.10.25j and 12.10.27k.
485	1	Chick, Melanie and Alden	Rules	Traffic, Access and Parking	Oppose	Landowners' land use rights should not be restricted by legislation; submitter limited in developing an additional driveway per Rule 12.10.25.	Delete consent requirements on private land so owners are allowed to develop as they see fit.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
479	1	Grand, Marcel Jean	Whole Variation	General	Oppose	Enough rules and regulations exist over private land.	Not stated.
486	1	Meridian Energy Ltd : Feierabend, Andrew :	Whole Variation	General	In Part	Submitter supports the inclusion of provisions that provide direction on the management of landscape values of the Kaipara District. Submitter seeks to ensure that these provisions are consistent with the RMA and balance the protection of the District's landscape values while providing for appropriate use and development of natural and physical resources, including the development, operation and maintenance of wind energy generation facilities.	Amend Chapter 18 so as to better enable and provide for appropriate renewable energy development, including the development, operation and maintenance of wind energy generation facilities while promoting the sustainable management of the identified outstanding natural landscapes and features and visual amenity landscapes of the District. Submitter also seeks any similar amendments with like effect and any consequential amendments that stem from the amendments proposed.
523	6	Transition Town Kaiwaka : Dalziel, Scott :	Whole Variation	General	In Part	Sizable pockets of bush need be protected from clearance even if not in OLA.	A stand of native trees, taller than 3m should be protected by law and a resource consent be needed to fell them.
15	2	Drury, Graham Maxwell	Whole Variation	Minor amendments (grammar, spelling and formatting)	Support	Supports the intent and scope of the provisions of Chapter 18 as appropriate for preserving and enhancing OLAs and VALs.	Adoption of Chapter 18 in its entirety with corrections to numbers and spelling as detailed in submission.
162	2	Finncane, Gary Philip Morris	Whole Variation	None	Oppose	Opposes the variation in entirety as renders property undesirable for future sale/use.	Exclude property from the variation.
190	1	Pirie, James and Stephanie	Whole Variation	None	Oppose	Variation overly restricts property rights.	Abolish Proposed Plan.
374	3	Te Runanga O Ngati Whatua : Pivac, Allan :	Whole Variation	None	N/A	Variation may cause confusion for Ngati Whatua landowners due to effects on other chapters of the Plan.	Suspend Variation until review of NRPS complete, using that time to consult with affected Ngati Whatua and other landowners.
516	1	Morgan, Tracey Lee	Whole Variation	None	Oppose	Opposes.	No decision sought.
254	2	Greville, John Willis	Whole Variation	OLA 2 - West Coast Ocean Beach	Oppose	The submitter does not believe that OLA 2 'West Coast Ocean Beach' is an outstanding landscape because the characteristics identified in Appendix 18A to define it as such are too generic and could describe and coastline in NZ.	Withdraw Proposed Variation 1 or carry out more work to identify the specific values that make OLA 2 an outstanding landscape

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
128	1	Blakey, David Roy	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose entire Variation. Variation restricts property rights.	Focus on other matters in the district e.g. weed control and road maintenance.
193	1	Chambers, Ken and Delwyn	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation imposes overly restrictive rules.	Abandon Proposed Plan and keep existing plan. Implement simple amendments to the existing plan as necessary.
233	1	Dalbeth, Herbert	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Excessive rules and regulations already exist	Decline Variation 1 in its entirety
251	1	Jurtich, Victor Raymond and Corile	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Leave things as they are.	Leave things as they are.
254	1	Greville, John Willis	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is opposed at the speed that Variation 1 - Landscapes was notified.	The submitter seeks that the whole variation is withdrawn
254	3	Greville, John Willis	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter states that much of the OLA area either cannot be seen from anywhere or is simply pasture	The submitter seeks that Variation 1 - Landscapes is withdrawn in its entirety or that OLA's are better defined to identify their outstanding qualities
257	1	Linthicum, Darwin	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation 1 is not the correct way in which to protect OLA's and VAL's.	Read 'Tragedy of the Commons' - attached to submission.
286	1	MacLean Partnership, Cameron MacLean	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Management of private land should be left to landowners/farmers. Chapter 18 imposes an unfair and unreasonable burden on landowners.	Council should purchase and fence off private land affected by Chapter 18.
291	3	McShane, Owen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed plan for initially leaving out Chapter 18.	The submitter seeks that the whole proposed district plan is withdrawn.
589[291]	11	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 291/3.	Accept submission 291/3.
291	4	McShane, Owen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter states that consultation on Chapter 18 has been inadequate	The submitter seeks that the proposed district plan is withdrawn in its entirety, including Variation 1.
346	1	Vincent, Reuben	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation is vague, does not set forth a clear plan and information has not been adequately checked for errors.	Delete the Variation in entirety.
383	1	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is of the opinion that there are already enough rules in the Kaipara District Plan to protect the environment from inappropriate development.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
383	6	Simon Woodcock, Maree Jones	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes Variation 1 - Landscapes because it may cause adverse effects on the environment.	Withdraw Variation 1 - Landscapes in its entirety.
384	1	McGillivray, Andrew and Christine	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Chapter 18 will restrict normal farming practice as consents will be required.	Exclude private property from OLAs. Delete all references to VALs from the Plan.
391	2	Hargreaves, Anthony and Lindsey	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Pursuant to s85(2) of the RMA, Chapter 18 relating to private property places an unreasonable burden on landowners and increases costs.	Not stated.
391	3	Hargreaves, Anthony and Lindsey	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Rules and regulations in the current District Plan effectively protect the environment.	No more rules or regulations.
395	1	Calveley, C	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation repeats and reinforces resource management errors perpetrated by the proposed district plan.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	32	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
395	2	Calveley, C	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation (and plan) creates complex management administration too demanding for Kaipara.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[395]	33	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 395 in its entirety.	Accept submission 395 in its entirety.
396	1	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation repeats and reinforces resource management errors perpetrated by the proposed district plan.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.
589[396]	46	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
396	2	Cattle Mountain Run Ltd : Putt, Brian :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation (and plan) creates complex management administration too demanding for Kaipara.	Delete Variation in entirety. Or prepare an alternative landscape chapter in full consultation with affected landowners.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[396]	47	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 396 in its entirety.	Accept submission 396 in its entirety.
406	1	Ball, Cyril	Whole Variation	Oppose	N/A	Submitter opposes Variation 1 in its entirety as nil growth.	Seeks that Variation 1 is not adopted.
408	1	Sommerville, Monika and John	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Submitter opposes the Variation 1 in its entirety	Submitter seeks the deletion of Variation 1
411	2	Birt, Derek	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed district plan, as it repeats a lot of what is in the operative plan.	No decision sought.
423	2	Biddles, Elizabeth Anne	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the entire Variation 1 Landscapes	The submitter seeks that Variation 1 Landscapes be rejected in its entirety
573[423]	1	Pryde, Arthur	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 423/2.	Allow submission 423/2.
578[423]	2	Woodhams, Louise	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Support.	Accept.
580[423]	2	Kidd, Penelope	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 423/2.	Allow submission 423/2.
582[423]	2	Mills, Stephen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 423/2.	Allow submission 423/2.
593[423]	4	Lee, Michael	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 423/2.	Allow submission 423/2.
605[423]	4	Blackmore, Ross	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 423/2.	Allow submission 423/2.
427	1	Knox, Freda Alice	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Submitter opposes Variation 1 - Landscapes in its entirety	The submitter requests that all references to VAL's in Variation 1 are discarded to maintain the status quo.
430	1	Fish, Isabel	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter states that Variation 1 - Landscapes increases their costs to do activities on their land.	The submitter seeks that the Variation not take place.
438	1	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes Variation 1 Landscapes.	No decision sought.
589[438]	13	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
438	4	Pouto Topu A Trust : Wright, Hayden :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter states that the proposed variation is contrary to Chapter 15A of the proposed Kaipara District Plan.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
589[438]	16	Farmers of New Zealand Inc. : Ward, Wayne :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Support	Supports submission 438 in its entirety.	Accept submission 438 in its entirety.
439	9	Anderson, Innes McRae	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes Variation 1 - Landscapes in its entirety	The submitter seeks to have all of Variation 1 - Landscapes withdrawn.
446	1	Toia, Harerei and others	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the OLA in the proposed Toka Toka Township	The submitter seeks that the entire Variation not go ahead.
458	1	Anderson, John	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 18 because of the restrictions on land owners.	Withdraw Chapter 18.
458	8	Anderson, John	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to Variation 1 - Landscapes because it is too prescriptive and domineering.	The submitter seeks that Variation 1 should be more encouraging and use incentives to promote landscape protection.
459	7	Bull, John R L	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose the method being used in the Variation as it is prescriptive and domineering rather than encouraging and enhancing.	A reward scheme for owners who plant, protect and nurture bush (e.g. through rates rebates and lighter controls) will achieve greater results than the current variation.
459	14	Bull, John R L	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of the variation in the Proposed District Plan.	Withdraw the variation.
468	1	Littlejohn, Kenneth W	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	OLA and VAL areas remove private property rights and do not make sense.	Decline Variation 1 in its entirety.
507	1	Simpkin, Stephen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation will devalue property and discourage future growth in the Kaipara District.	Council to focus on other matters in the District e.g. roading, water and waste management, parks and reserves.
507	2	Simpkin, Stephen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation is too complex and restrictive.	Council to focus on other matters in the District e.g. roading, water and waste management, parks and reserves.
511	3	McDermott, Terence	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Freehold land should not be subject to Council interference.	Total withdrawal from District Plan.
515	3	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter states that Variation 1 - Landscapes conflicts with Objective 15A.5.1 of the proposed district plan.	No decision sought.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
515	9	Te Roroa Whatu Ora Trust : Murray, Moengaroa Sharon :	Whole Variation	Oppose	N/A	The submitter is opposed to the proposed district plan being developed prior to the Northland Regional Policy Statement being released.	The submitter seeks delaying the proposed district plan until after the Regional Policy Statement has been developed.
540	1	Allen, Kevin Eric	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Enough rules exist and are effective, Council need not make more.	Leave system as is its working.
557[540]	1	Allen, Kevin Eric	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Opposes submission 540/1.	Disallow submission 540/1.
541	1	Findley, Christine	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation is unnecessary as rules exist to protect significant areas.	Delete Variation 1 in entirety.
559[541]	1	Findley, Christine	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Opposes submission 541/1	Disallow submission 541/1
59	1	Plooy, Steven Phillip	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Concerned about the Variation in its entirety due to financial implications.	Not stated
60	1	Kelly Family Trust, Derek and Kathleen	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	The proposed Variation is an infringement on private property rights.	Not stated.
92	2	Bishop, Robert Alan	Whole Variation	Oppose	Oppose	Variation 1 is a removal of private property rights.	Decline Variation 1 in its entirety.
126	1	Brown Richter, Laurie and Ingrid	Whole Variation	Support	In Part	Support in part Variation 1 - Landscapes but disagree with the requirement to fence off the bush.	Wants to be able to decide what they can do on their land.
228	1	Flavell-Johnson, Alex	Whole Variation	Support	Support	KDC has in the past had poor protection of outstanding landscapes from development. These developments have contravened the rules in the KDC DP and the provisions of the RMA.	A definition of "inappropriate" needs to be defined through public submissions.
236	1	New Zealand Historic Places Trust : Reynolds, Sherry :	Whole Variation	Support	Support	OLA and VAL areas hold historic associations and value to Tangata Whenua.	Variation 1 be adopted in its current form
266	2	Grieve, John Gibson	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Protection of outstanding landscapes supported.	Accept the Variation, with a view to later extending its scope to protect additional outstanding landscapes.
268	2	Grieve, James	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Protection of outstanding landscapes supported.	Accept Variation, with a view to later extending its scope to protect additional outstanding landscapes.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
269	2	Grieve, Justin Matthew	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Protection of outstanding landscapes supported.	Accept Variation, with a view to later extending its scope to protect additional outstanding landscapes.
271	1	Greenslade, Melanie	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Preserve native bush and restrict subdivision.	Accept the Variation.
272	2	Grieve, Shaye	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Protection of outstanding landscapes supported.	Accept Variation, with a view to later extending its scope to protect additional outstanding landscapes.
377	1	and others, Charlene Walker-Grace	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Te Uri O Hau Trust Board does not represent Te Komiti 2A3B. Support Chapter 18 and the two landscape classifications.	Chapter 18 to be included in the District Plan.
452	1	Environmental Defence Society Inc. : Serjeant, Kelsey :	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Generally supports Variation 1 subject to amendments.	Subject to wording included in the submission.
476	1	Jennings, Lorraine	Whole Variation	Support	Support	More reserves needed to enhance environment, particularly waterways.	Apply Variation 1 and acquire more reserves and bush land.
481	1	Vaughan, Molly Jane	Whole Variation	Support	Support	The Brynderwyn area needs to be more fully protected as is an ecologically significant and rare environment. No more clearing, buildings, roads or tracks should be permitted on these hills.	Extend Variation 1 to cover all of the Brynderwyn hills in an east-west chain from Mountain Road Maungaturoto to the seaward end of Bream Tail including Pukekaroro Mountain, Baldrock and the Cattle Mount.
494	1	Puharich, Nicola Margaret	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Supports chapter 18 a whole.	No decision sought.
496	1	Historic Places Trust, NZ	Whole Variation	Support	Support	OLA and VAL areas hold historic associations and value to Tangata Whenua.	Variation 1 be substantially adopted.
497	1	NZ Native Forests Reforestation Trust : Taylor, Michael J :	Whole Variation	Support	Support	OLA and VAL identification suitable for public and privately owned reserve land.	Not stated.
498	18	Northland Regional Council : Murfit, Justin :	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Generally supports Variation compared with status quo.	Not stated.
527	1	Flavell-Johnson, Alex and others	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Supports identification and protection of outstanding landscapes and natural features within the Kaipara district. (Petition of some 70 or so names).	Support Variation.
556	1	Herewood, W	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Support Plan.	Support Plan.

Sub. No.	Sub. Point	Name	Topic	Provision	Inclination	Summary	Decision Required
66	2	Chases Gorge Camp Club : Jones, Graham :	Whole Variation	Support	Support	Support the principle of the Variation.	Accept variation.