

PROPOSED KAIPARA DISTRICT PLAN

FS74

FORM 6 – FURTHER SUBMISSION

To Kaipara District Council – districtplanreview@kaipara.govt.nz

1. Further Submitter details

This further submission is made on behalf of

Marunui Conservation Ltd
c/o 18 Lincoln Street
Ponsonby
Auckland 1021

Email catherineh.lincoln@xtra.co.nz

Preferred method of contact Email

Phone 027 262 7904; 09 376 4069

2. Eligibility to make a further submission

Marunui Conservation has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest that the general public has.

3. Our reasons for selecting the above category are:

Marunui Conservation Ltd is a private company owning 423ha in the Brynderwyn Range accessed from King Road, Mangawhai. It was established in 1987 for conservation purposes and the entire property (Marunui) is covenanted in perpetuity with the QEII National Trust. It is part of a High Value Area recognised and supported by the Northland Regional Council.

Marunui falls within the Outstanding Natural Landscape ONL14 Bream Tail / Brynderwyn Ranges and is similarly identified in the Northland Regional Policy Statement as Landscape Unit: Brynderwyn Range and Bush margins. It also falls within the Brynderwyn Hills Forest Complex identified in DOC's Waipu Ecological District PNAP report as being the most ecologically diverse site in terms of forest and shrubland diversity. Significantly, the Brynderwyns have become a high density kiwi habitat

Some provisions in the Proposed District Plan have the potential to detrimentally affect the Brynderwyn Range and surrounds and their Outstanding Natural Landscape and significant ecological values.

4. Request to be heard at hearings

We wish to be heard at the hearing in support of our further submissions

*Catherine Hawley
On behalf of David Mather, Managing Director*

Date: 12 December 2025

5. Further submissions 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/disallowed. Details as below
FS74.1	Evolve Planning & Landscape Architecture	50	50.20	Support	Amendments to SUB-R7 will strengthen protection for Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Provisions are needed to require the protection of ONLs at the time of subdivision	Allow parts of the submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed rules are too permissive Amend activity status Add assessment criteria in relation to character and amenity values
FS74.2	Evolve Planning & Landscape Architecture	50	50.21	Support	Including a rule for subdivisions within ONLs at the time of subdivision will provide for their protection and ensure development is appropriate. Lack of such a provision does not meet requirements of RMA s.6(b)	Allow parts of the submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed rules are too permissive and there is no ability to decline Amend activity status Include rule at the time of subdivision in ONLs
FS74.3	Evolve Planning & Landscape Architecture	50	50.27	Support	In NFL-R2.5 the references to lots 1-4 and 6-14 as shown on the Survey Plan consented by RM090103 for lot 2 DP 316176 date back to an Environment Court decision of 17/4/2015. There is no need to include this site specific exclusion in the Proposed District Plan or references to "any subsequent s127 variations for Lot 2" (which are unknown). For any application made in future relating to this lot there should be reliance on the consent granted and the conditions imposed.	Allow parts of the submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete this site specific exclusion with its references from the Proposed District Plan's Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes chapter
FS74.4	M Vilde Wild Ecology Ltd	125	125.14	Support	Adding new rules limiting indigenous vegetation clearance as proposed within significant indigenous vegetation areas under Appendix 5 of the NRPS will serve to better protect sensitive and significant biodiversity.	Allow whole of the submission
FS74.5	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	149	149.44	Support	ECO-R1 f) allowing 1000m2 indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity in all zones is excessive and could have significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, especially in the Brynderwyns. Amount should be reduced or deleted.	Allow part of the submission with particular reference to ECO-R1 f) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter seeks deletion.

	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/disallowed. Details as below
FS74.6	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	149	149.58	Support	NFL-P4 should be amended to give greater emphasis to the retention of indigenous vegetation in ONLs and restrictions on its alteration and clearance	Allow whole of the submission
FS74.7	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	149	149.60	Support	Requiring compliance with standards NFL-S4 (earthworks) and NFL-S5 (indigenous vegetation clearance) for all permitted activities and cross referenced to the relevant rules NFL-R4 and NFL-R7 will better protect ONLs.	Allow whole of submission
FS74.8	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	149	149.63	Support	Limiting the clearance of indigenous vegetation per site In NFL-S5 will reduce the potential for cumulative adverse effects and protect the characteristics, values and qualities of ONLs and ONFs	Allow parts of the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure proposed limit is outside areas meeting NRPS significance criteria • Decrease permitted 150m2 of vegetation clearance per site
FS74.9	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	149	149.64	Support	The 20% increase in the gfa enabled by NFL-S6 is considered too large, particularly in situations where an existing building or structure is already large, eg. 350m2. Such an increase will have adverse effects on the ONL, contrary to the need to protect it.	Allow whole of submission
FS74.10	Cato Bolam Consultants Ltd	217	217.43	Support	ECO-R1 f allows 1000m2 indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity in all zones. This is excessive and could have significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, and fails to protect large areas of indigenous vegetation Amount should be reduced or deleted.	Allow part of the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECO-R1 f Reduce clearance of indigenous vegetation allowed as a permitted activity
FS74.11	Cato Bolam Consultants Ltd	217	217.44	Support	In ECO-R2 the provisions for clearance of indigenous vegetation and in one calendar year is excessive. A reduction in both will better protect biodiversity.	Allow whole of submission

	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/disallowed. Details as below
FS74.12	M Fyson	224	224.1	Support	In NFL-R2.5 the references to lots 1-4 and 6-14 as shown on the Survey Plan consented by RM090103 for lot 2 DP 316176 date back to an Environment Court decision of 17/4/2015. There is no need to include this site specific exclusion in the Proposed District Plan or references to "any subsequent s127 variations for Lot 2" (which are unknown). For any application made in future relating to this lot there should be reliance on the consent granted and the conditions imposed.	Allow part of the submission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete NFL-R2.5 from the Proposed District Plan's Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes chapter
FS74.13	Director General of Conservation	304	304.71	Support	The inclusion of a new policy outlining the specific assessment criteria of the NRPS Appendix 5 will ensure applications are assessed consistently, reflecting the need to protect significant indigenous vegetation	Allow whole of submission
FS74.14	Director General of Conservation	304	304.73	Support	ECO-R1 f allows 1000m2 indigenous vegetation clearance as a permitted activity in all zones. This is excessive and could have significant adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and fails to protect large areas of indigenous vegetation. Amount should be reduced or deleted	Allow part of the submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECO-R1 f Reduce clearance of indigenous vegetation allowed as a permitted activity
FS74.15	Director General of Conservation	304	304.92	Support	Permitting 150m2 indigenous vegetation clearance in any 12 month period in an ONL fails to recognise the protection afforded by RMA s.6(c). Therefore the permitted activity status proposed in NFL-R3 is inadequate.	Allow whole of submission
FS74.16	Horizon Surveying & Land Development	315	315.60	Support	There are minimal assessment criteria in SUB-S14 to provide for appropriate consideration of the effects of a subdivision of a site within a natural character, coastal environment, ONL or ONF. The addition of sufficient standards is needed in recognition of the significance of these areas.	Allow whole of submission

	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/disallowed. Details as below
FS74.17	Northland Regional Council	332	332.14	Support	ECO-O3 needs to reflect biodiversity outcomes as per the NRPS and this includes enhancing indigenous biodiversity and the management of pest species to reduce the threat to at risk species.	Allow whole of submission
FS74.18	Northland Regional Council	332	332.21	Support	In ECO-R2 the provisions for clearance of indigenous vegetation and in one calendar year is excessive. A reduction in both will better protect biodiversity.	Allow whole of submission