

**Proposed Kaipara District Plan:  
Form 6 - Further Submission**

*Clause 7 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

This is a further submission that is either in support of or in opposition to any submission already received by Kaipara District Council on any Proposed Kaipara District Plan topic **except for Light** in the Proposed Kaipara District Plan. No new submission points can be made.

All submissions and Summary of Submissions can be viewed on our website here:  
[www.kaipara.govt.nz/kaipara-district-plan-review/proposed-district-plan-submissions](http://www.kaipara.govt.nz/kaipara-district-plan-review/proposed-district-plan-submissions)

**Note:** *The topic of Light was notified for further submissions on 21 October 2025 prior to all other topics due to the hearing for Light being confirmed for 17 December 2025.*

**Note:** You can only make a further submissions on the submission points identified in an original submission on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan.

**1. Further submitter details** *(mandatory information)*

**Full name of individual/organisation making further submission:**

**Contact person** *(if different from above):*

**Email address:**

**Postal address:**

**Postcode:**

**Preferred method of contact:**

**Email**

**Post**

**Contact phone number:**

**Do you have an agent who is acting on your behalf?**

**Yes**

**No**

If you would like a copy of your submission sent to your agent, enter their email address below *(otherwise leave blank)*

**Agent email address:**

**2. Eligibility to make a further submission** *(for information on this section go to RMA Schedule 1, clause 8)*

I am (select one of the following options):

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

*In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category.*

A person who has interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has.

*In this case, also specify below the grounds for saying that you come within this category: or*

The local authority

### 3. My reasons for selecting the category ticked above are:

*(For example: Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest would likely include public interest environmental groups*

OR

*Any person that has an interest in the proposed policy statement or plan greater than the interest that the general public has is likely to include owners of land and users of resources directly affected by plan provisions. It is also likely to include iwi and hapu where their interests are directly affected.)*

### 4. Request to be heard at hearings

Yes, I wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission; or

No, I do not wish to be heard at the hearing in support of my further submission.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Yes

No



**Signature of further submitter:**

*(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)*

*(A signature is not required if you are making your further submission by electronic means)*

**Date**

## Important information:

1. This Form 6 is for further submissions on every topic with the Proposed Kaipara District Plan (apart from Light).
2. You must serve a copy of your further submission on the original submitter **within five working days after it is served** on Kaipara District Council.
3. The Kaipara District Council must receive this further submission before the closing date and time for further submissions (**5.00pm on Monday 15 December 2025**).
4. All information provided in your further submission is considered public under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and will be published to progress the process for the Proposed Kaipara District Plan and will be made publicly available. Your further submission will only be used for the purpose of the Proposed Kaipara District Plan.
5. Submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the Hearing will be emailed all relevant information relating to the Hearing. If you don't have an email address, it will be posted.

## Note to person making submission:

Your further submission (or part of your further submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the further submission (or part of the further submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious;
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the further submission (or the part) to be taken further; and/or
- It contains offensive language.

## Send your further submission:

**Post it to:** District Planning Team  
Kaipara District Council  
Private Bag 1001  
Dargaville 0340

OR

**Email to:** [districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz)

**OR you can hand-deliver this further submission form along with any attachments to:** any Kaipara District Council service centre (Dargaville at 32 Hokianga Road or Mangawhai at 6 Molesworth Drive). Please be aware that our service centre doors close at **4.00pm**.

**Please refer to District Plan Review on our website [www.kaipara.govt.nz](http://www.kaipara.govt.nz) where all information and updates are located.**

If you need any assistance at all, please contact the District Planning Team on 0800 727 059 or email us at [districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz](mailto:districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz).

Further Submissions must be received  
by: **5pm – Monday 15 December 2025**

**5. Further Submission/s on all remaining topics (excluding the LIGHT topic) on the Proposed Kaipara District Plan:**

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
<b>FS35.1</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.10	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the zoning within Mangawhai and Hakaru from General rural zone to Rural lifestyle zone.</p> <p>This is opposed to the extent that such an outcome may be appropriate elsewhere in the District although would require full analysis of the appropriateness of rezoning for Bream Tail and nearby general rural zoned sites.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.2</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.11	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the zoning in Mangawhai and Mangawhai Heads from General residential zone to Large lot residential, Medium density residential and High density residential.</p> <p>Medium density residential and high density residential outcomes are not appropriate for Bream Tail and nearby and adjoining general rural and residential zoned sites (assuming they are within the scope of the rezoning request sought).</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.3</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.23	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to add objectives and policies to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, using Whangarei District Plan as an example.</p> <p>Reference to another District Plan as an example lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis as to appropriateness in Kaipara.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.4</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.24	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to add more rules to the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter using Whangarei District Plan as an example.</p> <p>Reference to another District Plan as an example lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis as to appropriateness in Kaipara.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.5</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.26	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to delete all references to <i>"This rule does not apply to: The defined Exclusive Use Areas shown on the Survey Plan for lots 1-29, 32,34,40,41 and 45 DP 348513 consented by RM050086 (Bream Tail) provided that the other conditions of the Consent Notices (dated 2 February 2004) on these titles are complied with, which shall rely on</i></p>	Disallow

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					<p><i>Rule 12.10.3c.2 in Chapter 12 of the Kaipara Operative District Plan.</i>" within the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes chapter.</p> <p>The provisions are appropriate as they recognise the particular circumstances of the Bream Tail subdivision, including the detailed requirements of the consent notices that exist on the titles in respect to the location, height and design of new buildings, the design review process required to be in place, and the extensive landscape and ecological mitigations established and ongoing. This assists in reducing consenting burden and risks and, by enabling appropriate development in this way, the wider ecological and landscape benefits of Bream Tail are also enabled.</p>	
<b>FS35.6</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.30	Oppose	The submission seeks to delete GRZ-R11 and replace with the current impervious surfaces percentage in the Rural zone.	Disallow
<b>FS35.7</b>	Evolve Planning and Landscape Architecture	50	50.31	Oppose	The submission seeks to amend the general rural zone rules to provide an appropriate impervious area rule that mitigates any increase in impervious areas and is related to the size of the site.	Disallow
<b>FS35.8</b>	Loralie Sheppard	128	S128.2	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the zoning in the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth Area to be Rural lifestyle zone. This appears to include some of the land at Bream Tail.</p> <p>This is opposed to the extent that such an outcome may be appropriate elsewhere in the District although would require full analysis of the appropriateness of rezoning for Bream Tail and nearby general rural zoned sites.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.9</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.1	Support	<p>The submission seeks to add a definition for "Agricultural Aviation Activity".</p> <p>That is supported to assist to provide clarity for the scope of the activity as the intermittent, infrequent or temporary use of rural airstrips and helicopter landing areas, rather than airfields or heliports used on a regular basis or aircraft bases in fixed locations.</p>	Allow in full
<b>FS35.10</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.2	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Aircraft" which is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.11</b>	New Zealand Agricultural	146	146.3	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Airfield".	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
	Aviation Association				The further submitter agrees that it is important to have specific definitions capable of clearly defining the difference between airfields used regularly or as a fixed-location base, compared to rural airstrips used intermittently, infrequently or temporarily.	
<b>FS35.12</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.7	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Heliport".  Inclusion of a definition for a 'Heliport' will clarify the difference between a temporary helicopter landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis, and a heliport used on a regular basis or as a permanent base.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.13</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.13	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Rural Airstrip".  It is important to have specific definitions capable of clearly distinguishing 'Airfields' used on a regular basis or as a fixed base, versus 'Rural Airstrips' which are used intermittently, infrequently or merely on a temporary basis.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.14</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.14	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Temporary Helicopter Landing Area".  It is important to define 'Temporary helicopter landing area' so the term can be used to distinguish between a landing area used on an intermittent, infrequent or temporary basis versus a permanent heliport used on a regular basis or as a base.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.15</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.34	Support	The new objective sought is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.16</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.35	Support	Retention of the objective is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.17</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.38	Support	The further submitter agrees that it needs to be clear that use of temporary helicopter landing areas is excluded from NOISE-R6.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.18</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.39	Support	The scope proposed in the standard As notified does not include the full range of agricultural aviation activities.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.19</b>	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	146	146.40	Support	The scope of NOISE-S3 does not include the full range of agricultural aviation activities	Allow in full
<b>FS35.20</b>	New Zealand Agricultural	146	146.46	Support	The amendments to GRUZ-P4.3 are supported.	Allow in full

Further Submission by Bream Tail Residents Association Incorporated to the 2025 Kaipara Proposed District Plan

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
	Aviation Association					
<b>FS35.21</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.1	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Aircraft" which is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.22</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.4	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Helicopter Movement" which is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.23</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.5	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Heliport" which is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.24</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.7	Support	The submission seeks to add a definition for "Temporary Helicopter Landing Area" which is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.25</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	146.8	Support	The new objective is supported	Allow in full
<b>FS35.36</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.9	Support	The retention of the objective is supported	Allow in full
<b>FS35.27</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.10	Support	The new policy sought is supported	Allow in full
<b>FS35.28</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.13	Support	Helicopter construction activities should be recognised in the Proposed District Plan through the proposed NZS6803 'Construction Works' definition	Allow in full
<b>FS35.29</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.15	Support	The policy is appropriate for movements from a fixed location airfield or heliport used on a regular basis, however separate provisions should be added for the use of temporary helicopter landing areas for emergencies and/or ad-hoc commercial activities	Allow in part to the extent that the frequency of helicopter use should be less restrictive than that sought in the submission and allow movements on no more than 3 days within any 7-day period (rather than 3-month period) or otherwise in a manner that complies with NZS 6807. in full
<b>FS35.30</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.16	Support in part	Emergency, Temporary and infrequent helicopter activities should be provided for in the noise rule as sought, except that the frequency of use should be less restrictive than that sought and allow movements on no more than 3 days within any 7-day period (rather than 3-month period) or otherwise in a manner that complies with NZS 6807, with that sort of frequency typically appropriate in rural zones.	Allow in part
<b>FS35.31</b>	New Zealand Helicopter Association	147	147.20	Support	The relief of retaining (or including as the case may be) intermittent, infrequent or temporary commercial helicopter activities as a permitted activity in the proposed plan is supported.	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
<b>FS35.32</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.37	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to include SNAs in the District Plan or an objective regarding the identification of areas through new subdivision, use and development proposals using the Regional Policy Statement Appendix 5 criteria.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity specifies how indigenous biodiversity should be maintained, and gives effect to the RMA. If the Proposed Plan is to give effect to the NPS:IB this should be by way of a Variation to the Plan, rather than through submissions, for the sake of partnership, transparency and consistency.</p> <p>Relying on case-by-case assessment by landowners as sought, risks SNAs not being consistently applied and does not accord with the 4<sup>th</sup> schedule process envisaged by the NPS:IB.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.33</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.40	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend ECO-P1.1. to include or list of all New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement matters.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.34</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.56	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend policy NFL-p2 to allow lawfully established land uses to continue without undue restriction provided that additional adverse effects on the characteristics, qualities and values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes as set out in SCHED4 and SCHED5 are avoided.</p> <p>This submission does not accord with existing use rights enabled by the RMA 1991, nor does it give appropriate recognition of existing uses as required by the Regional Policy Statement for Northland.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.35</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.80	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks new objectives and policies that give effect to New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement policies listed, without specifying how.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.36</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	149	149.81	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend CE-P1 by changing 'land use and development' to 'activities' throughout</p>	Disallow

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
	Incorporated					
<b>FS35.37</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.127	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. Where provisions relate to Significant Natural Area identification, the submitter requests that they be implemented in the context of s6 Resource Management Act obligations and the relevant provisions of the Northland Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.38</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.128	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks amend the Proposed District Plan to provide stronger management tools for biodiversity with no specific reference as to how.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.39</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.129	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the full suite of objectives and policy direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.40</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.130	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.41</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.145	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to add policies to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter regarding the following matters to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.42</b>	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	149	149.148	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to add a catch-all rule for any use or development not provided for in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter as a discretionary activity.</p>	Disallow

FS35.43

Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
				This outcome places an unreasonable consent burden on landowners and is neither efficient nor effective in achieving the objectives of the proposed plan.	
Mohindar Randhawa	153	153.1	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks specific provision or new overlay to apply to 6 hectares of the property at 54 Mangawhai Heads Road, Mangawhai Heads to enable a development for the exclusive use of residents aged 50 years and over including a higher residential density than the current General residential zone allows. The submission seeks the net site area be reduced to 400m2.</p> <p>The relief sought is opposed because it does not provide for the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Protection of indigenous biodiversity of the surrounding locality, including prohibitions on dogs, cats and mustelids.</li> <li>b. Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining and nearby primary production activities in rural zones and precincts.</li> <li>c. Maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values, in recognition that the site subject to this submission provides a transition from urban to rural land uses.</li> <li>d. Provision of a sensitive transition to the Rural zone (including Bream Tail to the north), recognising the rural landscape values, including by the provision of lower residential densities, setbacks and landscape buffers and screening.</li> </ul> <p>The relief sought does not accord with good planning practice and is inconsistent with growth planning for Mangawhai, and the regional form objectives and policies from the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, including the Appendix 2 Regional Form and Development Guidelines.</p>	Disallow

FS35.44

Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
G Renall	179	179.1	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the zoning of part of the land at 144 Mangawhai Heads Road (Lot 3 DP 208703) from residential to commercial. The relief sought is opposed because it does not provide for the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values, in recognition that the site subject to this submission is within a transition from urban to rural land uses and a gateway to and from Mangawhai.</li> <li>b. Provision of a sensitive transition to the rural zone (including Bream Tail to the north), recognising the rural landscape values, including the protection of the night sky and quiet rural environment.</li> <li>c. The safety and operation of traffic and the safety of pedestrians.</li> <li>d. Protection of indigenous biodiversity of the surrounding locality, including prohibitions on dogs, cats and mustelids.</li> <li>e. Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining and nearby primary production activities in rural zones and precincts.</li> </ul> <p>The relief sought does not accord with good planning practice and is inconsistent with growth planning for Mangawhai, and the regional form objectives and policies from the Regional Policy Statement for Northland, including the Appendix 2 Regional Form and Development Guidelines.</p>	Disallow
The Rise Limited	260	260.1	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to retain the Cove Road North Precinct.</p> <p>For the reasons set out in the further submitter's primary submission, an extensive new set of provisions should be introduced to the Cove Road North Precinct, in respect to reverse sensitivity, providing an appropriate transition between urban and rural, protection of indigenous biodiversity, and the</p>	Disallow

FS35.45

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values.	
<b>FS35.46</b>	The Rise Limited	260	260.14	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to add an exception to minimum allotment sizes under SUB-PREC2- Cove Road North Precinct – S1 as follows: Except that no minimum net site area requirement applies to any allotment created around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a multi-unit development for which a resource consent or building consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units).</p> <p>The relief sought fails to provide for reverse sensitivity, an appropriate transition between urban and rural, protection of indigenous biodiversity, and the maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.47</b>	The Rise Limited	260	260.18	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the SUB-PREC2 - Cove Road North Precinct - MAT1, including an exemption to 2. Subdivision Design and 4. Northern Sub-Precinct to note the matters of discretion are not applicable where subdivision is to create allotments around an existing or proposed residential unit that forms part of a consented multi-unit development for which a resource consent or building consent has been granted (excluding minor residential units).</p> <p>The relief sought fails to provide for reverse sensitivity, an appropriate transition between urban and rural, protection of indigenous biodiversity, and the maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.48</b>	The Rise Limited	260	260.32	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks that the PREC2-Cove Road North Precinct Rules enable a pathway for Multi-Unit Development that is consistent with GRZ-12.</p> <p>The relief sought fails to provide for reverse sensitivity, an appropriate transition between urban and rural, protection of indigenous biodiversity, and the maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.49</b>	The Rise Limited	260	260.33	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the maximum percentage of the net site</p>	Disallow

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					<p>area covered by buildings and other impervious surfaces</p> <p>The relief sought fails to provide for reverse sensitivity, an appropriate transition between urban and rural, protection of indigenous biodiversity, and the maintenance and enhancement of rural character, landscape values and amenity values.</p>	
<b>FS35.50</b>	Cabra Mangawhai Ltd & Pro Land Matters Ltd	216	S216.51	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the extent of the Managed Growth Area and the policy framework needs to guide what the outcomes of the Managed Growth Area should be rather than just limiting growth. The submission refers to SD-UFD-P7.</p> <p>This is opposed to the extent that such an outcome may be appropriate elsewhere in the District although would require full analysis of the appropriateness of the policy approach across the Managed Growth Area as a whole, including for Bream Tail and nearby general rural zoned sites.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.51</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.01	Support	The matters summarise Section 108 Resource Management Act matters, but do not replicate the specific details of Section 108. This creates the risk of conditions imposed under the Proposed District Plan being out of step with the requirements of the Resource Management Act.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.52</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.2	Support	Reference to "stricter" may be open to interpretation depending on the circumstances of the proposal. It should be replaced with a reference to the activity status of a proposal being determined on the basis of all rules which apply to the proposal to avoid an evaluation of the strictest rule.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.53</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.6	Support	"Concentration" of rural lifestyle development as directed in this objective does not acknowledge that rural lifestyle development may be appropriate in a diverse range of locations across the district, particularly where this is achieved through conservation benefits e.g., at the further submitter's land at Bream Tail.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.54</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.10	Support	The proposed Financial Contributions provisions do not meet Resource Management Act requirements and there is insufficient section 32 analysis for the scope of matters for which a financial contribution can be taken under the Proposed District Plan.	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
<b>FS35.55</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.13	Support	The rule should also provide for other buildings ancillary to residential buildings within this specified threshold, which can establish without any further impact on the amount of indigenous vegetation cleared than that already provided for.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.56</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.14	Support	ECO-R2.4. imposes an unnecessary and unfair burden on landowners to prove that the indigenous vegetation meets the criteria in Appendix 5. That should be the role of the District Council to undertake on a district-wide basis, rather than on an individual application basis, which risks inconsistent application of the criteria.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.57</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.15	Support	Objective NFL-O1 correctly gives effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the Regional Policy Statement.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.58</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.16	Support	Policy NFL-P1 is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.59</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.17	Support	Policy NFL-P3 is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.60</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.18	Support	NFL-P4 is generally supported but it should be amended to ensure accurate inclusion in SCHED4 or SCHED5 of the descriptions used in the evaluation sheets which informed the Regional Policy Statement mapping, including a full description of the characteristics, qualities and values of the outstanding natural landscapes in each case, as is sought elsewhere in this submission.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.61</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.19	Support	Policy NFL-P2 should also recognise that lawfully established subdivision, with sites as yet	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					unbuilt, are also located within Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes, including the further submitter's sites at Bream Tail.	
<b>FS35.62</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.20	Support	Recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under NFL-P6. This aligns with the NFL-P2 recognition of existing use and development, which would otherwise not come into play when considering these restricted discretionary activity matters.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.63</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.21	Support	External additions and alterations to existing buildings or structures should not be limited as to gross floor area to achieve permitted activity status. The reference to gross floor area might for example better replaced with a reference to the standard NFL-S6 Minor upgrading.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.64</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.22	Support	The default to non-complying activity would require a wholesale reassessment of the appropriateness to build on these already approved exclusive use areas and nominated buildable areas. It imposes considerable unnecessary cost and risk. For these reasons, the rule is sought be amended to apply the same permitted activity provisions whether the building or structure is inside or outside the coastal environment.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.65</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.23	Support	Rule NFL-R3 only applies permitted activity status to indigenous vegetation clearance in Outstanding Natural Landscapes outside the coastal environment, and not for Outstanding Natural Landscapes within the coastal environment. In addition, no provision is made for Indigenous vegetation clearance in the Outstanding Natural Features, leaving the activity status for that uncertain. The only provision for permitted activity Indigenous vegetation clearance in Outstanding Natural Landscapes within the coastal environment is made at NFL-R3.6 for regionally significant infrastructure.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.66</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.24	Support	A restricted activity status (as is the effect of the Proposed Plan rule as sought to be amended by this submission) is appropriate for earthworks on approved building platforms and the access	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					driveways to them inside and outside the Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature, noting that the appropriateness of construction on approved building platforms has already been determined at subdivision stage.	
<b>FS35.67</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.25	Support	The rule is supported, noting the submitter's other relief sought for indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity in particular circumstances.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.68</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.26	Support	Additional allowances should be made for roof top projections within specified parameters. Requiring resource consents for the placement of such features where they exceed the height is inefficient and adds costs which do not outweigh the benefits	Allow in full
<b>FS35.69</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.27	Support	The standard unnecessarily limits gross floor area and is considered too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.70</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.28	Support	The standard should allow for the use of natural materials as a permitted activity, with such materials being visually suitable in Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features areas, including in the coastal environment.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.71</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.29	Support	The amendments will better give effects to the Regional Policy Statement Objective 3.14 in respect to the coastal environment, which requires the protection of the qualities and characteristics that make up the natural character of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.72</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.30	Support	CE-O2 properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.73</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.31	Support	The policy is supported, subject to the accurate inclusion and description of the characteristics, qualities and values that make an area a High or Outstanding Natural Character Area in SCHED6	Allow in full
<b>FS35.74</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.32	Support	CE-P2 properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.75</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.33	Support	CE-P3 properly gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
<b>FS35.76</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.34	Support	Specific recognition should be given to the existence of consented building platforms and access to those platforms when considering resource consent applications under CE-P6.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.77</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.35	Support	To recognise that lawfully established existing subdivision, use and development are located within the coastal environment and allow them to continue without undue restriction. The further submitter's sites at Bream Tail is an example of this.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.78</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.36	Support	Gross floor area should not be limited to achieve permitted activity status.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.79</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.37	Support	Permitted activity status is an efficient and effective way of recognising these existing expectations to build under the terms of consents and avoids the costs associated with new consent for buildings on locations already as appropriate by way of previous consents.	
<b>FS35.80</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.38	Support	Make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the coastal environment and High Natural Character Areas, is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people. The exclusion is sought only to apply to the High Natural Character Areas and not Outstanding Natural Character Areas.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.81</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.39	Support	CE-R4 is appropriate.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.82</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.40	Support	Additional allowances should be made for rooftop projections within specified parameters. Within the specified height limits as sought in the submission, these features will have no or negligible impact on the on the characteristics, qualities and values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.83</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.41	Support	Natural materials are visually suitable in coastal areas.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.84</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.42	Support	Gross floor area is opposed because it is too low to accommodate many residential dwellings, including the average size of a dwelling in New Zealand.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.85</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.43	Support	The objective seeks to restrict a functional or operational need test for non-rural activities to	Allow in full

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					locate in the General rural zone. While 'restrict' does not direct 'avoid' as is sought to be implemented by proposed policy GRUZ-P5, it nevertheless applies an inappropriate test for activities that may not necessarily be rural productive activities themselves but are either supportive of such activities or otherwise compatible.	
<b>FS35.86</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.44	Support	The outcome is supported and gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.87</b> <b>FS35.88</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.45	Support	Maintenance or rural character and amenity values is supported.	Allow in full
	Daytona Trust	263	263.46	Support	The Regional Policy Statement directs the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities and amendments are sought accordingly.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.89</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.47	Support	Functional and operational need is an inappropriate test here for activities that may not necessarily be rural productive activities themselves but are either supportive of such activities or otherwise compatible.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.90</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.48	Support	GRUZ-R2. appropriately provides for agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities as a permitted activity.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.91</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.49	Support	The ability to construct one residential unit on a site less than 24 hectares as a permitted activity is supported.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.92</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.50	Support	The requirement for the separation distance is unnecessary and, in some part, runs counter to the benefit created by the rule.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.93</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.51	Support	Providing for the use of buildings and land for recreation or leisure is an accepted and desirable part of rural life, and as exhibited by the common facilities at the further submitter's Bream Tail site, desirable for social and community wellbeing.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.94</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.52	Support	Additional allowances should be made for roof top projections within parameters, solar and water heating components and satellite dishes above the roof line of the building.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.95</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.53	Support	The submission to add a Bream Tail Precinct is supported.  Bream Tail presents a large landholding with a complex arrangement of land uses and ownership structure not practically managed by simply its General rural zone and overlays alone.	

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					<p>Bream Tail is different from other rural residential lifestyle developments, with its scale, very low density of residential development, land reserved for conservation purposes, and farm operating over the balance of the property. These characteristics warrant an integrated and comprehensive resource management approach for Bream Tail as a whole; and</p> <p>Bespoke planning provisions provide appropriate recognition of the existing and consented environment at Bream Tail, including that established through the previous subdivision consents and conditions to be complied with as required by instruments on the titles. They allow certain Proposed Plan provisions to be tailored to reduce consenting burden and risk.</p>	
<b>FS35.96</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.54	Support	The use of the correct descriptions in SCHED5 of outstanding natural landscapes is important because of the requirements of the related policies in the Proposed District Plan.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.97</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.55	Support	A link or inclusion of the correct descriptions of characteristics, qualities and values of identified natural character areas in SCHED6 is important because related policies in the Proposed District Plan require an assessment against them.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.98</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.59	Support	The submitter is seeking the addition of a Bream Tail Precinct into the Proposed District Plan	Allow in full
<b>FS35.99</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.68	Support	The drafting of NFL-R2.2. requires improvements to achieve its intended outcome to specifically recognise the particular circumstances of the Bream Tail subdivision, including the detailed requirements of consent notices that exist on the titles as set out in the submission.	Allow in full
<b>FS35.100</b>	Daytona Trust	263	263.69	Support	Rule NFL-R3 should be amended to make additional allowances for indigenous vegetation clearance which by its nature will have minor effects on the Outstanding Natural Landscape (whether inside or outside the coastal environment), is required to enable positive effects, or is required for the health and safety of people	Allow in full
<b>FS35.101</b>	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	265	265.1	Oppose	The submission seeks to amend the Proposed District Plan to give effect to national direction and regional	Disallow

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
					<p>planning instruments in a way that is specific to Kaipara.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	
<b>FS35.102</b>	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	265	265.4	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the relevant objectives, policies, rules and standards to ensure planning outcomes are achieved which will not jeopardise the integrity of Kaipara's natural environment.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.103</b>	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	265	265.5	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.104</b>	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	265	265.6	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the Public Access chapter to give effect to national direction and regional planning instruments.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.105</b>	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	265	265.7	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the entire Coastal Environment chapter to give effect to national direction.</p> <p>This lacks the specificity of relief required of submissions to a proposed plan and is not supported by s32 analysis.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.106</b>	Tovolea Farm Ltd	291	291.10	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to amend the Proposed District Plan to apply the Rural lifestyle zone at the urban fringe consistent with the Harbour Overlay in the Operative Plan and reconsider or remove the Mangawhai/Hakaru Managed Growth overlay, particularly where it contradicts the intentions of the operative plan and structure/spatial plans.</p> <p>This is opposed to the extent that such an outcome may be appropriate elsewhere in the District although would require full analysis of the appropriateness of the policy approach across the Managed Growth Area as a whole,</p>	Disallow

	Name of original submitter	Original submitter number	Original submission point number	Support or oppose	Reasons for supporting or opposing	I seek that the whole (or part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed)
<b>FS35.107</b>	Director General of Conservation	304	304.71	Oppose	<p>including for Bream Tail and nearby general rural zoned sites.</p> <p>The submitter seeks to add a new policy to the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter to require activities not provided for in ECO-R1 to obtain from a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist confirming that the indigenous vegetation proposed to be cleared does not meet the criteria in Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement 2016.</p> <p>Subject to the amendments sought in the further submitter's primary submission, the policies of the proposed plan adequately provide for the protection of indigenous biodiversity.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.108</b>	Director General of Conservation	304	304.73	Oppose	<p>Various amendments to ECO-R1 are sought by the submission.</p> <p>Apart from the need to also provide for the construction of buildings ancillary to a single residential unit as sought by the further submitter's primary submission, ECO-R1 as proposed provides for an appropriate range of exceptions to the Indigenous vegetation clearance requirements.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.109</b>	Director General of Conservation	304	304.74	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to permit a maximum of up to 150m<sup>2</sup> of vegetation clearance in all zones and require discretionary activity consent if this threshold is exceeded, accompanied by an assessment against Appendix 5 of the Northland Regional Policy Statement by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist using the Wildlands Report.</p> <p>Subject to the relief sought in the further submitter's primary submission, rules ECO-R1 and ECO-R2 provide appropriate permitted activity standards, including exceptions generally consistent with the Regional Plan for Northland.</p>	Disallow
<b>FS35.110</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	308	308.53	Support	<p>A new standard that addresses an apparent gap for unreticulated development scenarios and the provision of an adequate firefighting water supply in Cove Road North Precinct is supported, given the risk of rural fire in respect to the further submitter's property and wider.</p>	Allow